SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 01364 8671

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 01364 8671

3
B H2215y
Yorke
Life of Philip Yorke v.3
84358
Aug4'41 1459
Aug19'41RE
Sep2'41RE

BOOK NO. B H2215y 3 | ACCESSION 84358

FORM 3431 20M 1-41

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 01364 8671

DATE DUE

11/10/00			
11/28/00			
12/16/00			

HIGH SMITH REORDER #45-230

THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF PHILIP YORKE LORD CHANCELLOR HARDWICKE

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOLUME III

Works by the same Author:

Letters of Princess Elizabeth of England, Daughter of George III and Landgravine of Hesse-Homburg, written for the most part to Miss Louisa Swinburne. T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1898

A Note-Book of French Literature, 2 vols. Blackie & Son, 1901, 1904

LORD CHANCELLOR HARDWICKE

FROM A MEZZOTINT AFTER T. HUDSON

THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF PHILIP YORKE EARL OF HARDWICKE LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF GREAT BRITAIN

by

PHILIP C. YORKE, M.A. Oxon.,
Licencié-ès-Lettres of the University of Paris

And a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Isaiah xxxii. 2.

O could I flow like thee, and make thy stream
My great example, as it is my theme;
Though deep, yet clear; though gentle, yet not dull;
Strong without rage, without o'erflowing full.
DENHAM, *Cooper's Hill.*

VOLUME III

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1913

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET
Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
Chicago: THE CHICAGO UNIVERSITY PRESS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

B
H2215 3/4
84358

3 1223 01364 8671

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME III

CHAPTER XXVIII

DOMESTIC HISTORY 1757—1760

PAGE

Narrative. Habeas Corpus Bill—Pitt's attack on the Lawyers—Lord Hardwicke's speech—Absurdities of the Measure—Liberty by Common Law and Statute—Refers Bill to the Judges—Censures reflections upon the Judges—Bill thrown out without a division—Pitt's conduct—Its significance and motive—*La Dame Inconnue*—Attack on General Yorke—Lord Hardwicke's indignation—Continues to support the administration 1

Correspondence. The Highland Regiments—Resistance to the Militia Bill—Mobs and Riots—Unpopularity of the Measure—Lord Hardwicke's opinion of Pitt—The King and his money—The Habeas Corpus Bill—Pitt's conduct—Lord Hardwicke's opposition—Pitt's attempt to bribe the King—Accuses Lord Hardwicke of "Vanity"—"Puts water into his wine"—Increase of the Judge's salaries—Pitt demands Garter for Lord Temple—Threatens the King—The King's refusal—The King forced—Joseph Yorke and *La Dame Inconnue*—Lord Holderness's intrigue—Pitt's *Querelle d'Allemagne*—Lord Hardwicke's indignation—The King's support—Ill-treatment of General Yorke—His complaints—Pitt's censures—Lord Hardwicke defends him—Lord Holderness—His motives—Situation of General Yorke—Lord Hardwicke insists on reparation—Lord Temple obtains the Garter—Lord Hardwicke's interview with Pitt—Lord Hardwicke's memorandum adopted—Newcastle's letter to General Yorke—Explains his conduct—Pitt's changed attitude—Letters from General Yorke—Newcastle's fears—Pitt's "studied conduct"—Lord Keeper Henley—Lord Hardwicke on the King 31

CHAPTER XXIX

THE GREAT WAR 1757—1760

Narrative. Favourable domestic situation—The expeditions—Duke of Cumberland's defeat—Convention of Closterseven—Disastrous situation—End of the Hanoverian policy—Attitude of Frederick of Prussia—General Yorke's mission to Frederick—Frederick signs the Convention—Results of the mission—General Yorke's return to the Hague—Disputes with the Dutch—*Annus mirabilis*—Lord George Sackville—Attitude of Spain—Attitude of France—Possibility of Peace—Pitt's conduct—Spain becomes hostile—Campaign of 1760—Death of the King—His character 113

Correspondence. Rumours of Hanoverian neutrality—The Duke's defeat at Hastenbeck—Lord Hardwicke urges prompt measures—Perplexed situation—Pitt's good disposition—Letter from Clive—Lord Loudoun's

PAGE

failure in America—Submission of Hanover—The British ministers remonstrate—Convention of Closterseven—Repudiation by the British ministers—The King's disapproval—Lord Hardwicke summoned to town—Reception of the news abroad—The King's displeasure with the Duke—The Duke's resignation—Control of the army—Importance urged by Lord Hardwicke—His congratulations to Clive—Situation of the King of Prussia—General Yorke's mission to Frederick—Account of conversations—Frederick's plans—His political system—Project of invading France—Description of his person—His firm support of the Alliance—General Yorke's return—Lord Anson on the state of the Navy—Exercises the fleet—Yorke's account of Frederick's army—His dress and habits—Order and discipline—Frederick's Generals—Frederick's Genius—Berlin and Potsdam—Affairs of Holland—Minden—Lord George Sackville—Amherst's success—Quebec—Prospects of peace—The separate negotiation—Pitt's attitude—Amherst's conquest of Montreal—Pitt determines on another campaign—Reply to the Spanish memorials—Death of the King 157

CHAPTER XXX

GEORGE III AND THE FALL OF THE WHIGS

Narrative. The new system—Lord Hardwicke and his family—Newcastle retains office—"I glory in the name of Briton"—Bute Secretary of State—Victories of 1761—Negotiations for peace—Pitt's despatches—Dissensions in the Cabinet—Pitt demands war with Spain—Refused by the Cabinet—Pitt's speech in the Cabinet—His resignation—Cause and motive of this step—His conduct of the negotiations—His motives—Distrust of his policy—Ill-effects of his resignation—Lord Hardwicke declines Privy Seal—War with Spain—Lord Bute's diplomacy—Separation from Frederick—Refusal of the subsidy—Hardwicke quits the Administration 255

Correspondence. Duke of Newcastle's situation—Lord Hardwicke's advice to retire—Newcastle continues in office—The King's first Speech—Hopes of peace from Pitt—His conditions—Change of attitude—His despatches—Claims the Newfoundland fishery—Dissensions in the Cabinet—Pitt adheres to his opinions—Hostility of Spain—Pitt's resignation—Accepts pension and peerage—Conversation with Lord Hardwicke—Lord Bute's bid for popularity—General Yorke on Pitt's conduct—Pitt's speech in the House of Commons—War with Spain—Attitude of Frederick—The continental war—Lord Bute's desire to withdraw—Lord Hardwicke's interview with him—Endeavours to dissuade him—Prussian subsidy refused—Newcastle's resignation—His account of events—Lord Hardwicke left out of the council . 304

CHAPTER XXXI

THE ADMINISTRATION OF LORD BUTE

Narrative. Situation of the Whig lords—Lord Hardwicke against opposition—Charles Yorke and Charles Pratt—Consequences of their rivalry—Bute embarrassed by further victories—Has recourse to Fox—Hardwicke's speech against the peace—Weakness of the opposition—Bribes and menaces of the Government—Hardwicke still against opposition—Newcastle will not acquiesce—Hardwicke's speech against cider tax—Fall of Bute—Conversation with Charles Yorke—End of Fox 360

PAGE

Correspondence. Lord Hardwicke on opposition—Interview with Lord Bute—Declares his union with Newcastle—No longer consulted in public business—Prince Ferdinand's victory—Ill-treatment of the Brunswick Princes—Conference with Lord Hardwicke—The two grand points—Bute's unpopularity—Charles Yorke and the Great Seal—Conferences—The Duke of Newcastle's plans—Audience with the King—Hardwicke against an opposition—Conquest of the Havannah—Newcastle's "Middle Scheme"—Further overtures from the court—Hardwicke's advice—Newcastle refuses to acquiesce—Duke of Devonshire's dismissal—Conversations with Pitt—Situation of Hardwicke and his family—Left out of the council—The peace—Duke of Newcastle's situation—Letter of reproach to Hardwicke—Lord Hardwicke's reply—Subsequent conference—Pitt refuses to join the opposition—Devonshire and Kinnoull on Hardwicke—Hardwicke's encouragement—Proscriptions—*Impavidum ferient ruinae*—Resignation of Lord Bute 389

CHAPTER XXXII

THE OPPOSITION

Narrative. The Wilkes case—Lord Hardwicke's attitude—Libel and Parliamentary privilege—Charles Yorke's opinion—Pitt summoned to the King—Failure of the negotiation—Charles Yorke and Pitt—Charles Yorke resigns—His difficult situation—Speech on privilege—Speech on general warrants—Lord Hardwicke's last illness—His death 459

Correspondence. Arrest of Wilkes—Charles Yorke's opinion—Hardwicke deprecates support of Wilkes—Proceedings before Pratt—Wilkes discharged—Hardwicke's interview with Egremont—Pitt's "hankering after Charles Yorke"—Lord Hardwicke and Pitt's legal notions—Pitt "sprinkles Holy Water"—Hardwicke's letter to Dundas—Charles Yorke's interview with Pitt—Further proceedings before Pratt—Lord Hardwicke's criticisms—Refuses presidency of the Council—Advice to the King—Pitt's change of attitude—Hostility towards Charles Yorke—Charles Yorke's amazement—Lord Hardwicke on the situation—Pitt's negotiation with the King—Its failure—Lord Bute's banishment—Pitt's intentions—Further interview with Charles Yorke—Pitt's demands—Declares his preference for Pratt—Charles Yorke's situation—Complaints to the Duke of Newcastle—Pitt blamed—Charles Yorke resigns—Pitt's complaints of the Yorkes—Charles Yorke's audience with the King—Question of privilege—Resignation of John Yorke—The Whigs follow Pitt—Debate on the privilege—Duke of Cumberland and Hardwicke—The Cambridge contest—Debates on the General Warrant—Death of Lord Hardwicke—Conclusion 487

Index 568

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, from a mezzotint by John Faber, after Thomas Hudson . . . . . *frontispiece of vol. III.*

Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, from a portrait by William Hoare, R.A., with the kind permission of Sophie, Dowager Countess of Hardwicke *to face p.* 483.

LIST OF ERRATA

P. 1, l. 1, *for* was *read* were.

P. 145, par. 2, l. 10, *for* Ossun, Charles III.'s minister *read* Spain.

P. 290, par. 2, l. 15, seems to have done, *omit* comma.

P. 369, 3 ll. from bottom, *for* chose *read* choose.

P. 473, 5 ll. from bottom, *for* offence *read* defence.

CHAPTER XXVIII

DOMESTIC HISTORY 1757–1760

THE strength and superiority of the new administration was at once apparent. It combined all the best experience, with a few exceptions the chief talents and the most substantial power. The Duke of Newcastle's system of managing the House of Commons himself through a subordinate, one of the chief causes of the weakness of former administrations, was now abandoned, and Pitt's influence and eloquence carried all before him. The strife of parties in Parliament completely ceased. Pitt adopted in their entirety the measures of the late ministry, which he had before so severely criticised, instilled a new vigour into them, and encountered, in the absence of all opposition, far less difficulty in carrying out a determined and steady policy and in securing supplies.

The cabinet, however, still continued to be agitated by the contentions of faction and of personal interests and jealousies, which threatened on several occasions to overthrow it; and probably, but for Lord Hardwicke's sustaining and moderating influence, would have done so. Pitt had obtained a large access of power. He enjoyed the chief control of the war and of the negotiations abroad, and had even installed James Grenville, his brother-in-law, in the Treasury, the Duke of Newcastle's special domain, while George Grenville had been appointed Treasurer of the Navy. This, however, was not enough. The Duke still remained the head of the administration, with independent powers of general supervision and of correspondence with the ministers abroad, with a large majority in both Houses of Parliament, with the control of supplies and of the elections and with the King's support in the Closet. Pitt's chief source of power was popularity, and no occasion was neglected to increase it by raising and leading popular clamours.

A favourable opportunity soon offered itself. The wrongful

impressment of a person for military service, not authorised under the various Acts of Anne or under 29 George II, c. 4, in 1756, or 30 George II, c. 8, in 1757, which provided for the pressing of those who were not voters and who did not follow any lawful calling, supplied the needed material for a great outcry, led by Pitt, that the liberties of Englishmen were endangered and Magna Charta and the Petition of Right violated.

There was no question of injury to the particular individual, who had immediately secured his release by an order of the Secretary at War, which was one method of obtaining relief[1].

A second method was by an application for the writ of *Habeas Corpus*. The framers of the famous Act of 31 Charles II, however, had restricted the issue of the writ to commitments for criminal offences, other than for treason and felony, excluding besides all commitments for civil causes. They recognised doubtless that to oblige the judges to issue the writ in all cases would have reduced the execution of the law to a farce[2]. The liberty of the subject from arbitrary arrest, however—a point which was overlooked by the supporters of the Bill now introduced in the House of Commons—had by no means been first established by the Act of Charles II, which created no new rights and merely declared, as had also Magna Charta, privileges inherent from time immemorial in every freeborn Englishman[3]. Every person could therefore seek relief under the Common Law; but in cases which were not covered by the Statute of Charles II, the judges only issued the writ after requiring affidavits and entering into the merits of the application.

A large number, however, of cases coming before the Courts of alleged wrongful impressment, the judges, "beginning to see the difficulty of steering properly between the liberty of the subject and the necessities of the public[4]," had lately met in conference and had adopted another procedure. The Court, instead of granting the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, made a rule upon the Commissioners appointed by Parliament for the execution of the Press Acts, to show cause why the writ should not issue, and in default discharged

[1] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 901; *Clode Military Forces*, ii. 18, with Charles Yorke's opinion, 587–8.

[2] *Statutes at Large*, viii. 432. "If it issued of mere course, without showing to the Court or judge some reasonable ground for awarding it, a traitor, or a felon, [or a dangerous lunatic] might obtain a temporary enlargement by sueing out a *Habeas Corpus*." Blackstone *Com.* (1825) iii. 132 and cf. Stephen's *Blackstone* (1903) showing the modern usage, i. 83. "At the same time, it is a rule with the Courts that they will not grant a *Habeas Corpus* as of course and without probable cause shown."

[3] Hallam, *Const. Hist.* iii. 12, chap. xiii.

[4] Sir M. Foster to Ch. Yorke, *Life* by Dodson, 52.

the applicant from the condition of a soldier, who then regained all his civil rights, an advantage which he would not have obtained by the writ, when he would still have been exposed to capital punishment for desertion. The new procedure had been publicly notified, and in the first case which came before the judges after its adoption, Charles Yorke, as Solicitor-General, declared in Court, on behalf of the Crown, that there was no objection to the discharge of such as had been unduly pressed. It met with general approval among the public, no single person having ever afterwards applied for a *Habeas Corpus* who did not change his application into a motion for the rule. At the same time the rule was not obligatory, and no application for the writ had ever been rejected on that account[1]. On the other hand, the refusal of the judges to issue the writ, as of course, except in cases covered by the Act of Charles II, and their insistence on affidavits, preserved to some extent the extraordinary powers of the military authorities in impressments, then considered necessary for the security of the country. Had the grant of the writ been compulsory, as of course, the delay involved in answering to it and in furnishing proofs of the eligibility of the various individuals would have made the whole system of impressments unworkable, which depended for its success on proceedings summary and, by their very nature, unjust and tyrannical.

There was no doubt here, in the system itself, a very serious infringement of the liberty of the subject, which involved injustice and hardship, all the more intolerable because not shared by the whole community. It could only be defended on the plea of absolute necessity. The very existence of society involved some curtailment of individual liberty. The *Habeas Corpus* itself has been temporarily suspended, when such a measure was deemed essential to the maintenance of public order, without which individual liberty is impossible ; and the freedom of the subject was at once sacrificed, and at the same time secured, by the arbitrary military impressments, without which there would have been no army and no navy, no national defence, and consequently no nation.

Moreover, it was the Parliament itself, and not the Courts of Law, which was responsible for these infringements upon liberty. The Act passed a very short time before this discussion in the Commons, 29 George II, c. 4, "for the speedy and effectual recruiting of his Majesty's land forces and marines"—to use the

[1] Dodson's *Life of Sir M. Foster*, 50; Sir J. Eardley Wilmot's *Opinions and Judgments*, 87.

words of one of the judges, who appear to have been far more sensible of the real nature of such enactments than the ministers or legislators in Parliament—"is founded in the violation of private liberty....The power given to the Commissioners is to change the condition of men, under certain descriptions, into the condition of soldiers, against their will." He shows that summary proceedings were expressly instituted by the wording of the Act. No proof that the persons so seized came within the description, as laid down by the Act, was necessary. The Commissioners were merely to examine them and to judge them such. Everything depended upon the opinion of the Commissioners and the parish officers. "The execution of the special powers given by this Act...is like no other case whatsoever. It is not like a conviction; it is not in writing; it is not by way of punishment for an offence[1]."

Such were the real circumstances of the case, which Pitt had either not the patience to master or the candour to allow. Instead, aided by his faithful supporter, Sir Charles Pratt, the Attorney-General, who was qualifying by his popular inclinations to be Pitt's Chancellor in the future, and by George Grenville, he led the clamour and lent his name, without once consulting Lord Hardwicke or Lord Mansfield, the two lawyers in the cabinet, to an unfair and discreditable attack upon the law and the judges; and gave his support to an ignorant and impracticable Bill—"productive of the greatest inconveniences and full of absurdities beyond imagination[2]"—for taking away the discretion of the judges and making the grant of the writ of *Habeas Corpus* obligatory upon every application.

[*Debate in the House of Commons on the* Habeas Corpus *Bill, March 17th,* 1758*.]

When I returned from the House of Lords, Mr Attorney-General [Pratt] was speaking, and laying down the question to be whether the writ of *Habeas Corpus* was discretionary or of right and *ex debito justitiae*; spoke well and with warmth; and declared there had been sufficient provocation, as the *Habeas Corpus* had not been granted when applied for, but a new method, that of a rule to shew cause, constituted in its stead, during which time the subject was in durance, and that this was, in his opinion, illegal....

[1] Sir J. Eardley Wilmot, *Opinions and Judgments*, 77–84.

[2] Lord Lyttelton, *Memoir* by R. Phillimore, 608.

* [H. 530, f. 33.] I believe this came from Mr West, Secretary to the Treasury. H.

He was answered by Mr Oswald[1], who insisted on a probable cause being shewn to the Judge, previous to the granting the writ. Mr Pitt spoke with great acrimony against the lawyers, though he commended the candour and love of liberty in the person who opened the debate, viz. the Solicitor-General[2], which, he said, "was inherent in his family"; said he would live under law, but never under the government of lawyers; that the law has been broke by not granting the *Habeas Corpus* immediately when applied for, and that if the Committee of Courts of Justice was open, the person who had so done and instituted another method, would be amenable to it; that the Counsel, who agreed to the method of having a rule to shew cause why the party was imprisoned, had no right to do so; and that compounding a felony was a less offence than compounding a great law of liberty; that in considering that, he would never be entangled in the cobwebs of Westminster Hall, and any Judge shall be forced to hide his head who nibbles at the liberties of the people; that a Judge's business was *jus dicere, non facere*; that he ought to give the law mechanically by rule and square; that no Judge ought to consider the reason of state or public inconveniency; that that was the business of the Council, and he would not bear to see it exercised by the King's Bench; that discretion was dangerous; no trusting to the multiform, clashing, inconsistent opinions of Westminster Hall; that it became absolutely necessary to have the Bill, if they did not mean to leave every Englishman's birthright to the discretion of a Judge.

Mr Beckford[3], and Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer [Legge] spoke very shortly, and said the Judges must themselves wish to have no discretion, and there would be no danger to the army or navy from it.

Mr George Grenville closed the debate by reading the 4th Resolution of the Lords and their address to the Queen, drawn by Lord Somers in 1704[4], and asked what that great Lawyer, Statesman and Freeman would have thought, if the words "at the discretion of the judge" had been added to that Resolution.

On putting the question for commitment the ayes were very loud and almost universal; the noes only 6 or 8. So no division.

"We at last heard a debate on the *Habeas Corpus* Act," writes Alexander Carlyle of himself and the historian Robertson, "which Pitt had new modelled in order to throw a slur on Lord Mansfield, who had taken some liberties, it was alleged, with that law, which

[1] James Oswald (1715–69), M.P. for Kirkcaldy Burghs; a Commissioner for Trade.

[2] Charles Yorke, one of the few who opposed the Bill in the Commons; for notes of his speech see H. 533, ff. 58 sqq. and below, p. 43.

[3] William Beckford (1709-70), Jamaica merchant, and great admirer and supporter of Pitt; alderman and M.P. for the City of London, Lord Mayor, 1762 and 1769.

[4] "That every Englishman, who is imprisoned by any authority whatsoever, has an undoubted right...to...obtain a writ of *Habeas Corpus* in order to procure his liberty by due course." *Lords Journals*, February 27th, March 13th, 1704–5.

made him unpopular....The Attorney General...rose and spoke with clearness, argument and eloquence. He was ably answered by Mr Yorke, Solicitor-General....At length Mr Pitt rose, and with that commanding eloquence in which he excelled, he spoke for half an hour, with an overpowering force of persuasion more than the clear conviction of argument....With all our admiration of Pitt's eloquence, which was surely of the highest order, Robertson and I felt the same sentiment, which was the desire to resist a tyrant who, like a domineering schoolmaster, kept his boys in order by raising their fears, without wasting argument upon them[1]."

There could be no doubt what the attitude of Lord Hardwicke would be. He had previously warned Pitt that the measure would be opposed by him in the strongest manner, and when the Bill reached the Lords on May 9, 1758, he took the lead in moving its immediate rejection, and in vindicating the action of the judges, whose loyalty to the constitution and to the national liberties had been aspersed. He began with some sarcastic references to the pretensions of the orators in the House of Commons to dictate on points of legal procedure, and concluded by referring the matter back to the twelve judges, the proper authorities to consult on such questions, to whom he put three questions for their opinions.

"[*Endorsed by Lord Hardwicke,*] *1st Paper. Notes of first speech May 9th, 1758, with some notes in the margin for the last speech June 2nd* (H. 530, f. 37).

"Were I to judge of this Bill by the title, that is given to it, nothing can bear a more respectable or engaging name.

"Were I to judge of the accuracy of it from the length of time it has been preparing in another place—*four months*—I should expect nothing from it but *perfection.*

"If I could suffer myself to estimate it by the great esteem and respect I have for some of the persons, who have stood forth as patrons of this Bill, it would create in me the strongest impressions in its favour.

"But I cannot, I ought not, to suffer myself to judge of this Bill by any such rules.

"These are at best but prejudices.

"The title may be a misnomer and tend only to mislead us —confound the course of law and entangle liberty, instead of protecting it.

[1] *Autobiography*, 336.

"Length of time sometimes produces darkness instead of light.

"And respect of persons ought never to enter into legislative or judicial considerations.

"This Bill must be judged of by its own intrinsic merits.

"Necessary in the first place to direct one's thoughts to the principle, or ground, on which it was originally conceived and proposed, the utility and rightness of the provisions contained in it.

"The principle has changed its shape in the progress of it.

"First was—that the *Habeas Corpus* Act, 31 Charles II, had comprehended and provided for all the cases of confinement or restraint of liberty, *public* or *private*.

"But that the judges had unwarrantably narrowed it by construction.

"This was soon deserted, as it must be by everybody who could but read the black letter, in which the statute is printed; and the Commons have now sent up, not a declaratory, but a new enacting Bill.

"The next ground was, that it is true the statute, 31 Charles II, did not extend to all cases, but only to cases of commitment and imprisonment for criminal or supposed criminal matters, and there were still remaining many cases of writs of *Habeas Corpus* at the Common Law, not within that Act; but that the judges of the Court of King's Bench could not legally grant such *Habeas Corpus* at their chambers in vacation time, except in cases within the *Habeas Corpus* Act, and here was a defect in the law that required a remedy.

"Another ground taken up was that, by the Common Law, abstracted from the statute of Charles II, a writ of *Habeas Corpus* ought to be granted *of course* to any person, who was imprisoned or restrained of his liberty, on any pretence whatsoever, merely for praying it, without laying before the Court any probable cause to show that it was a wrongful restraint.

"That the King's Courts and judges had practised otherwise, and this was a great abuse and breach of the law, in violation of the subject's liberty.

"Both these grounds, or pretences, I would rather choose to call them, appeared strange and unaccountable to me. I had taken some pains in studying the law books, had been a diligent attender to what had passed in Westminster Hall for 45 years, observed and collected the decisions of the judges, served the

Crown in offices which had the most to do with proceedings on writs of *Habeas Corpus*, had the honour to preside successively in the two great Courts which have the principal jurisdiction of writs of *Habeas Corpus* for 23 years, and never found any such doctrine in the precedents of the Courts or proceedings of the judges. Notwithstanding some loose sayings in one or two books, I had never heard it doubted in practice, that a *Habeas Corpus* at Common Law, not within the statute of Charles the 2nd, could not [*i.e.* could] be granted by a single judge of the King's Bench in vacation time returnable before himself at his chambers.

"Had frequently done it myself in vacation time, and in so doing had followed the example of my Lord Ch. Justice Holt, the best and ablest of my predecessors—a long course of precedents.

"Further, I never met with a position in the law-books, nor heard of an opinion or precedent in Westminster Hall, that a *Habeas Corpus* at Common Law was a *writ of course* to be granted for asking, without a probable cause shown.

"*A writ of right* it is, and God forbid that it should not [be]. But it is like many other writs of right. In the first instance the party lays a case, a reasonable ground before the Court, to show the probability of his right. And where is the hardship of this? 'Tis only to represent his own case by the oath of himself or of a friend. The meaning of a writ of right is that it is a writ *ex debito justitiae*; but then the party must show the Court that there is some probable ground of justice in his case.

"I will not at present give any positive opinion; I choose to avoid it. I reserve that till I have received a fuller and better information. I am only stating the practice followed by myself and such of my predecessors as, I hope, were never charged with want of zeal for liberty.

"Under these circumstances, I must be forgiven if at first I was surprized at these new lights.

"I will go one step further, still giving no positive opinion. I could not help considering what good has the *Habeas Corpus* Act of Charles II, that favourite law, done to the subject, if the last position is true.

"That law so much contended and struggled for, brought in two or three times, pushed by the ablest and most zealous advocates for liberty of those days—if it is really true that at Common Law, a *Habeas Corpus* was a writ of course, which the

judges by their office and oath were bound to grant merely for praying it, this favourite law, I say, instead of enlarging, has narrowed and restrained the remedy of the subject for his liberty.

"In the first place, it excepts all cases of commitments for treason or felony plainly and specially expressed in the warrant of commitment, which certainly were within the general rule of the Common Law, as the patrons of this Bill lay it down.

"In the next place, in all other criminal cases it obliges the parties to produce to the Court or the judges a copy of the commitment or an affidavit that such copy has not been delivered on demand.

"That is a probable cause, for the commitment is produced to show whether the party may, in the event, be entitled to relief.

"I know it may be said that the penalties and other provisions made by that statute are an additional benefit to the subject, and so they are; but if the act has so far limited and narrowed the foundation of the subject's relief *in limine*, it will be found that, according to the principle of this Bill, the other provisions are much too dearly purchased.

"That act, therefore, instead of being entitled *an act for the better securing the liberty of the subject*, as it now is, ought, according to these new notions, to have been entitled, *an act for abridging the subject's remedy for his liberty.*

"However, (for I will still give no opinion) those great men, Mr Serjeant Maynard[1], Sir William Jones[2], Sir George Treby[3], might all grope in the dark and mistake their way; 'tis possible; and the discovery might be reserved for their *more enlightened successors*, who framed this Bill.

"But in this general view a further observation struck me, and it struck me very strongly. How came justice in criminal causes ever to have been administered in the circuits before the *Habeas Corpus* Act of Charles 2nd? According to this new discovery, a prisoner in gaol for any capital crime might have applied for a *Habeas Corpus* before the Assizes, have obtained it for asking without showing any ground and afterwards have been remanded.

[1] Sir John Maynard (1602–90), the famous lawyer and judge; he drew up Strafford's impeachment; serjeant at law, 1654, but opposed to Cromwell's government; knighted at the Restoration.

[2] Sir W. Jones (1631–82), Attorney-General, 1675.

[3] Sir George Treby (*c.* 1644–1700). Recorder of London, 1680, but dismissed by the King; counsel for the seven bishops. Recorder again at the Revolution and Attorney-General, 1689; Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, 1692.

Thus he might have infallibly avoided his trial, and have done it *toties quoties*; for their rule admits of no limitation, no discretion in the judges to refuse it by reason of the party's having brought a former *Habeas Corpus* and been remanded before.

"Another great difficulty occurred. At the Common Law this writ of *Habeas Corpus* ought of right to issue out of the Court of King's Bench to any of the King's dominions, parcel of his Crown of England. I have authorities for it and will mention one. To Calais, when a domain of this Crown, Cro[ke] Jac: 543; *Richard Bourn's* case. It is declared by the Court of King's Bench that the writ of *Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum* hath been awarded out of that Court to Calais. It ran into the Islands of Jersey and Guernsey. It does so now. Hale, C. J., in his *History of the Common Law of England*, 'This writ of *Habeas Corpus* lies into the Islands of Jersey and Guernsey for our imprisoned there.' And there are cases in the law books where it has been actually granted by the Court of King's Bench. 1, Sid[erfin] 386.

"I could not reconcile it to my poor understanding how the Common Law of England, the result of the wisdom of ages, could be so loose and vague, as that a person imprisoned or restrained of his liberty in Jersey or Guernsey for a cause ever so just, whether criminal, civil or domestic, should be allowed to come to Westminster Hall, obtain a *Habeas Corpus* for no reason but merely for praying it and oblige his gaoler, his creditor, his father or his guardian, or a wife her husband, to be at the expense and vexation of bringing them over to England, perhaps in order to be rescued by the way, and this *toties quoties*.

"It appeared to me, at first sight, still more extraordinary that the very same objection lies against the Bill now before you.

"The framers of this Bill seem not to have attended to it that the *Habeas Corpus* Act of King Charles 2nd does, by express words, extend to the Islands of Jersey and Guernsey.

"Sect. 11. 'And be it declared and enacted by the authority aforesaid that a *Habeas Corpus* according to the true intent and meaning of this Act may be directed and run into any county palatine, the cinque ports or other privileged places within the Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales or Town of Berwick upon Tweed *and the Isles of Jersey and Guernsey*.' Thus Jersey and Guernsey are put upon the very same foot with counties palatine, the cinque ports and privileged places in England.

"What does the present Bill do? I desire your Lordships will

attend to it. It expressly extends *all the provisions of the Act* for the awarding of writs of *Habeas Corpus to all cases* where any person (not committed for criminal matter) shall be confined or restrained of his or her liberty under any colour or pretence whatsoever; and the Court is obliged to grant the writ upon an affidavit only that the party is actually confined or restrained, without any other cause shown.

"Therefore, by this Bill, every man that is prosecuted for the King's service in Jersey or Guernsey, every wife, son, daughter or ward, every person who wants to get possession of a lunatic, may come to Westminster Hall, at any time, and oblige them to be brought over from those Islands, without showing any cause at all.

"I will still adhere to the rule which I have prescribed to myself at present, not to give any particular positive opinion. But I cannot help mentioning one general observation more, which strikes me very strongly and is, I think, of vast importance.

"The *Habeas Corpus* Act, 31 Charles II, is not to this day a law in Ireland. It has been often attempted and has as often, in the best of times, been rejected on account of the state of Ireland, which made it not safe for the King's Protestant subjects there.

"I have in my hand no less than five instances of rejecting it in Council, held in the reigns of King William the 3rd and Queen Anne. There have been more.

"Now, what did all this struggle signify if, by the Common Law of England, every person was entitled to his writ of *Habeas Corpus* of course upon demand, without showing any probable cause? For, if it was the Common Law of England, it must be also the Common Law of Ireland, and must have been so ever since the reign of King Henry 2nd; for in the reign of that great Prince, about the year 1171, the Common Law of England was given to Ireland (Poynings' Act, in Henry VII's time, gave them the English statutes up to that time); and consequently, they might at any time have applied to the Court of King's Bench at Dublin or a judge of that Court, and the judges must by their oaths and office, have granted the *Habeas Corpus*, without asking *why*.

"I have chose at present to apply myself only to the general principles of this Bill, and to avoid entering into the particular frame and parts of it, as they will affect the Crown, the subjects, the peace, the good order of England. I beg leave to reserve myself as to those points till I shall have received more lights from the method I shall humbly propose to your Lordships to proceed in.

"You will always take care of the important point of personal liberty. It has been the great object of the legislature. It has been the great object of the attention of the Courts in Westminster Hall, ever since I have known them.

"But under a false, delusive notion of fortifying liberty, you will have a care how you destroy all authority, both public and private, enervate the laws, and by new inventions enacted by the legislature, chalk out methods to elude the laws, to make them instruments of vexation and oppression against those who are best entitled to be protected by them. This will be to sap the very foundations of liberty. The law is at the same time the standard and the guardian of our liberty. It both circumscribes and defends it. Law without liberty is tyranny. Liberty without law is anarchy and confusion.

"In revolving this subject formerly as well as now in my own mind, I have never thought (I speak it subject to better information) that there was more than one defect in the law relating to the *Habeas Corpus*, as it stands at present. And that is the want of a sufficient and speedy remedy for the judges to compel returns to such writs in vacation time. No process of contempt can issue till the Term comes. In this the *Habeas Corpus* Act itself is defective.

"But this defect, so material and so obvious, this boasted Bill has not cured, nor even attempted to cure it.

"At present [will] not enter further into the merits of this Bill. Reserve that to myself when the argument shall be entered into more at large.

"It is also a Bill for alteration of the law—particularly mixed with and relating to the course of proceedings in the great Courts at Westminster.

"Scarce an instance of passing such a Bill without asking the opinions of the judges, not whether it is fit upon political reasons to pass such a Bill—that is a legislative consideration—but to inform your Lordships in law. Peculiar privilege and advantage of this House that the twelve judges attend here by the King's writ.

"Have more than once known Bills, sent up from the other House, which have appeared very plausible there, have been found, upon the better lights produced by this House, to be in the highest degree improper and inexecutable, even to the conviction of the original framers of them.

"It is impossible to judge whether the law wants amending or not, without knowing authentically how it stands at present; impossible to judge whether the proposed alteration is proper without being informed what will be the legal construction of the Bill, and how it will operate in practice.

"Beg leave to propose to the learned judges questions under three heads. State them. [1. Whether in cases not within the Act 31 Charles 2nd, writs of *Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum*, by the law as it now stands, ought to issue of course, or upon probable cause verified by affidavit? 2. Whether in cases not within the said Act such writs of *Habeas Corpus*, by the law as it now stands, may issue in the vacation by *Fiat* from a judge of the Court of King's Bench, returnable before himself? 3. What effect will the several provisions proposed by this Bill, as to the awarding, returning and proceeding upon returns to such writs of *Habeas Corpus*, have in practice, and how will the same operate to the benefit or prejudice of the subject[1]?]

"The two first questions relate to the law as it now stands, and are necessary to be asked—specific and want no explanation.

"The third and last is proposed in order to have it clearly laid before your Lordships what will be the legal effect and operation of the material provisions of the present Bill, if passed into a law. Necessary to be known as a foundation to judge whether it is expedient to pass it." (N.B. This question was afterwards waived upon a difficulty started by the judges[2].)

"I propose it thus generally as carrying with it the greatest fairness and candour. But I think it incumbent upon me to open and exemplify to your Lordships some of the chief heads which I desire to be informed of under this question...."

[These observations, as the Bill was rejected and as the judges avoided replying to this question, are now omitted.]

"Propose that the judges deliver their opinions *seriatim* with their reasons.

"Could wish that they would take a little time, but hope not longer than Thursday.

"As to myself—have a great deal more matter on the subject

[1] H. 530, f. 49; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 903.

[2] For an opinion in reply to this question, probably by one of the judges, who begins by stating his difficulty in answering it on account of the provisions of the Bill being of so "mixed" a character, see H. 530, f. 91.

of this Bill, but that would lead me to give an opinion on particular points.

"Beg the indulgence of the House afterwards, etc.

"Many other branches of your civil liberty besides personal liberty.

"Personal liberty essential to them all, because without it, the others cannot be enjoyed.

"But take care to secure that in such a manner as to be consistent with the security of the other[s]...."—

Lord Hardwicke was answered on behalf of Pitt's faction by Lord Temple, who echoed Pitt's enthusiasm on the subject of liberty, warned the House not to be influenced by Lord Hardwicke and Lord Mansfield, two law Lords, and strongly opposed the submitting any questions to the judges as derogatory to the dignity of the House. He declared them interested parties and protested, in a phrase borrowed from Pitt, that he would no more take his law from them than his religion from the bishops[1].—

"The Earl of Hardwicke in his answer, which was above an hour long, expressed his great astonishment that the noble Lord should oppose the hearing of the judges, which had always been granted and, he believed, had never before been opposed; but it implied great diffidence of the merits of the Bill, when the patrons of it were averse to have any further light given to the House on the subject....That he was persuaded that his Lordship could not mean, and did not feel the force of, the reflection which he had thrown out on the judges, since such reflections were as improper as they were undeserved, no body of men since the Revolution being less liable to the suspicion of corruption or any false bias than they. That the consequence of lessening the credit of the law and the character and reputation of those entrusted with the execution of it, was highly dangerous; since, whatever might be the abilities of a minister of state, the public safety did not depend upon them but upon the due regard paid to, as well as the just administration of, the civil authority[2]."—

He then proceeded to read out the resolutions from the *Lords Journals* cited by Lord Temple in support of his argument, and showed that they had no application to the point at issue, such resolutions, moreover, being at best mere ordinances of one House

[1] Below, p. 49.

[2] T. Birch's account from the Hardwicke papers, printed *Parl. Hist.* xv. 898; and Walpole, *George II*, iii. 116.

of Parliament, which were never embodied in any Act and had no legal weight[1]. He continued:—

"*Let us stand upon the ancient ways.* Leave the legislative power where it is; the executive power where it is; the power of beginning Bills of supply where it is, and the power of judicature where it is.

"This is [the] only way to preserve this limited Monarchy upon which the Constitution, this happily mixed government, stands.

"Never flattered the Crown with opinions in point of law; won't now flatter the people. Tends to the destruction of both. Much less do this at the expense of

"1. Enervating the law—opening ways of eluding and defeating the execution of it, the most sure way of subverting the law. President Montesquieu, *Essai des Lois*, Livre 26, chap. 20. 'No man can be in a state of liberty who is not governed by law. We are then free because we live under laws.'

"2. Not do it at the expense of censuring and condemning the Courts of Justice and all the judges for 130 years past, as if they had been in a general conspiracy against liberty.

"Call to your minds who they have been!

"3. Not do it at the expense of taking away from the King's judges the power of judging according to law.

"This Bill transfers that power from the judges to the party or the person making the affidavit.

"*Obj*: Discretion[2].

"*Ans*: Abuse of the word. 'Tis the power which all judges must have, a power of discerning, exercising their judgment according to the rules of law upon their oaths.

"On this point how vain is what is contended for!

"'Tis admitted they must have that power in the material part, discharging, bailing or remanding.

"If you can't trust them with this other, in vain have you made them for life[3].

"4. Criminal cases not within this Bill. No jealousy ever lay against the judges in cases between party and party. The impartial administration of justice, one distinguishing honour of this country.

[1] H. 530, f. 43.
[2] See Pitt's speech above, p. 5.
[3] In the margin are here repeated the various inconveniences arising from the Act.

"The Statute 31 Charles II drew the line properly; provided for the cases where the temptations to err might lie,—criminal prosecutions of the Crown; left private cases to the old rule.

"They proceeded like wise men.

"5. Nothing could possibly depreciate and dissolve it, the civil authority in this country, so much as this.

"'Tis not to sound high the power of a particular office of state that will support the civil authority.

"That consists chiefly in the law and in the administration of justice. The King speaks with the greatest force and energy by his Seals and by his judges.

"6. If any Lord should not lay so much weight on the objections of inconvenience and mischief, consider what is the good of it? Show the inutility, inefficiency, and I had almost said, futility of this Bill. It concludes in no obligation, no effectual object for the liberty of the subject. I do this by comparing this Bill with the Act 31 Charles II. There a clear precise object; concludes in a certain obligation of all the judges.

"1. The object—to secure the subject against oppression from the Crown.

"Draws the line properly, describes principles.

"Takes in all cases capital and of misdemeanour.

"Makes distinct provisions in each; state them.

"2. In each concludes with an obligation on the judges to bail or discharge the party.

"This Bill concludes only with requiring them to discharge or bail or remand the party.

"That is all the power they have now, and is all that the most partial or corrupt judge can wish for.

"Here is no *final end*—no *obligation* for the relief of the subject. One of the learned judges said very justly—'A judge who would refuse a *Habeas Corpus* in a case where he ought to grant it, would equally refuse to discharge or bail the party in a case where he ought to bail or discharge him.'

"What then does all this signify?

"At the expense of vast inconvenience in a multitude of cases, only may establish injustice in some others with more ceremony and circumstance.

"It will be *magno opere nihil agere.*

"7. This Bill so framed as to be incapable of being amended in the Committee.

"Many reasons against attempting it; but the *impossibility* sufficient*."

Lord Granville's speech which followed "seemed designed more for the diversion of the House than for delivering his own opinion, much less for enforcing it." His chief topic in favour of the Bill was "its popularity," and that "the House had better pass the Bill at first than at last." Finding, however, the Bill to be unpopular at St James's, he attended the debate no more[1]. Lord Mansfield spoke strongly against it, and after further debate it was unanimously agreed to refer Lord Hardwicke's three questions, with the addition of some others now proposed by Lord Temple, to the judges, as the most proper persons to consider and deal with such matters.

The judges returned their answers on May 25, 26, and 30[2]. While varying in their replies to some of the problems put before them by Lord Temple[3], and desiring not to respond to Lord Hardwicke's third question as to the consequences of the Bill, they were unanimous in agreeing that by law in cases outside the statute of 31 Charles II the writ ought not to issue of course, but only upon probable cause verified by affidavit, and moreover, that none of the provisions of the statute extended to cases of impressment. On June 2, accordingly, the Bill, after further speeches by Lord Hardwicke and Lord Mansfield, was rejected without even a division[4].

* [Eighth heading erased.] Admonition about falling upon particular professions of men; has always hurt those who have practised it. Political Testament. [There are some pencil notes of Lord Temple's speech, and another Paper (f. 77) contains various objections made by Lord Hardwicke to the details of the Bill, but which do not seem to have been communicated to the Lords.]

[1] Walpole, *George II*, iii. 116. Lord Lyttelton writes to H. May 10, 1758 on Granville's strange conduct in joining with Pitt and Temple in the attack on Westminster Hall, but "his imagination has always been too strong for his judgment." H. 247, f. 192.

[2] Cf. Walpole's nonsense (*George II*, iii. 117). "Lord Hardwicke, who the last year would have detained Admirals under sailing orders of the utmost consequence, affected to see danger in this delay, in which by the nature of the thing there could be no danger but in not giving it sufficient deliberation; and was urgent that the judges should have but two days to consider the point; so little decency did that man observe in pursuing the dictates of his passions. But in this, as in the former case, the House, with all its complaisance, declined acquiescence and allowed the judges above a fortnight. It was not expected that Lord Hardwicke would have taken up the point so strongly as Lord Mansfield, whom he did not love, was aimed at by the Bill; but Charles Yorke, his son, who resented that Pratt was preferred to him for Attorney-General, had declared against the Bill, even without consulting his Father." (Also *Letters*, iv. 138–9.) Lord H. had deprecated delay, fearing it would be the occasion of political intrigues among the judges. Below, pp. 49–52.

[3] For these see H. 530, ff. 49, 75; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 903.

[4] Cf. Walpole, *George II*, iii. 115. It "was rejected in compliment to Lord Mansfield

"All the judges, the Lord Keeper [Henley], the Chief Justice [Mansfield] and the late Lord Chancellor," writes Mrs Montague, "gave their opinions against the *Habeas Corpus* Bill. Lord Temple, much in wrath, insulted the judges in some of his questions; Lord Lyttelton warmly and sharply reproved him, upon which words rose so high, the House of Lords interposed. The last day of this Bill, Lord Mansfield and Lord Hardwicke spoke so fully to the matter, even the Tory Lords, and those most violent in their wishes for it, declared they were convinced the new Bill was dangerous to liberty in many respects, in many absurd[1]; so that, had there been a division, there would not have been four votes for it, but Mr Pitt's party discreetly avoided a division. This affair has not set the legislative wisdom of the House of Commons in a very high light, but the great Mr Beckford...did, on the motion for a vote of credit, stand up in the House of Commons and say he would not oppose that measure, as he had an opinion of the two commoners in the administration, but in the Peers that composed it, he had no confidence, and ran on in foul abuse of them, and then ended with a severe censure on the House of Lords in general. Lord Royston answered him that this was unparliamentary where personal, and indecent in regard to the House of Peers in general; to which Mr Pitt answered with great heat that he was sorry to hear such language from a gentleman who was to be a Peer; he set forth the great importance and dignity of Mr Beckford personally, and above all the dignity and importance of an Alderman, concluding it was a title he should be more proud of than that of a Peer. This speech has enraged the Lords, offended the Commons, and the City ungratefully say, it was too gross[2]."

After the rejection of the Bill, Lord Hardwicke moved that the judges should prepare a new measure which, while leaving their discretion undisturbed, extended the power of granting writs of

...and to gratify the private pique and public authority of the family of Yorke, the head of which always considered what was the law, never on what grounds a law had been made." His statement that the judges "contradicted one another and no two of them but differed on some particular case" is absolutely false; so is the assertion that Sir M. Foster, one of the judges, "was zealous for the Bill and published a large pamphlet in support of it." He was in favour of the measure drawn up by the judges. See below and Dodson, *Life of Sir M. Foster*, 57 sqq.

[1] The Duke of Devonshire also, who had at first approved of the Bill, became, on fuller information, a strong opponent of it. Walpole, *George II*, iii. 114.

[2] Mrs Montague's *Correspondence* (1813), iv. 79; cf. Elliot to G. Grenville (*Grenville Papers*, i. 248), "others, still more profane, ridicule *Habeas Corpus* and still persist in the old opinion that an Alderman of London is inferior to a Peer of England."

Habeas Corpus in vacation, which apparently belonged only to the judges of the King's Bench—a defect in the law to which he had himself called the attention of the Lords in the debate—to all the judges at Westminster. The Bill was to afford process to compel obedience to the writs, and further, the judges were to consider some provision for the production of affidavits to controvert the facts contained in the return to the writ[1].

The general result of the debate, and of a proper examination into the subject, was to completely absolve the judges from any infringement of popular liberties, to expose the folly and ignorance of those who had so rashly attacked them, and to draw attention to some difficult points of procedure connected with the famous writ, in which reforms might be practicable and advisable if undertaken by proper persons of experience and responsibility. The spurious interest, however, in the cause of liberty, died down as suddenly as it had flamed up, and the limited reforms proposed by Lord Hardwicke were not carried into law till 1816, at the close of the next reign, by which time impressments for military service had for some time been discontinued[2].

A measure, which had been under consideration for some time, for the increase of the judges' salaries, hitherto fixed at a very inadequate amount, and to which no retiring pensions were attached, was now again brought forward. Pitt, according to Walpole, insultingly declared that "the increase had been made to reward the complaisance of the judges on the occasion of the Bill of *Habeas Corpus*, and that it was the largest fee that ever was given." In

[1] This last was a point of importance and had reference to the fact that the judges had no power to traverse or inquire into the facts as stated in the return to the writ, which, if alleging matter sufficient to justify restraint, although false, would thus prevent, unless clear proof were otherwise offered to the judges, any relief by means of the writ. It appears that it had been proposed to give liberty to traverse returns to the writ on the occasion of the Bill of Rights, but the measure was dropped. The opinion of the majority of the judges seems to have been that "only the verdict of a jury or a judgment on demurrer or otherwise in an action for a false return" could traverse the facts contained in the return. For this point and the reasons for this opinion see *Opinions and Judgments* of Sir John Eardley Wilmot, 105–129; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 903 sqq.; Dodson, *Life of Sir M. Foster*, 49 sqq.

[2] 56 George III, c. 100, *Statutes at Large*, lvi. 505; Swanston's *Reports*, ii. 1–91; Dodson, *Life of Sir M. Foster*, 49–73; *Opinions and Judgments* of Sir J. E. Wilmot, 81–129; Clode, *Military Forces of the Crown*, ii. 8, 17–8, 587–8; Stephen's *Blackstone's Comm.* (1903), iii. 704; for Walpole's rubbish see *George II*, iii. 101–4, 112; Stanhope, *Hist.* (1846), iv. 185 sqq., has misunderstood entirely the real questions at issue, especially in making the measure passed in 1758 by the Commons the original of 56 George III, c. 100. See the Bill drawn up by the judges, printed in *Life of Sir M. Foster*, 68 sqq., of which the Act of 1816, with a few unimportant variations, is a literal copy; below, pp. 42–53.

spite, however, of his opposition and of that of George Grenville and Alderman Beckford, a Bill providing for an increase of £11,450, which was strongly supported in the House of Commons by Charles Yorke, was voted on June 16, 1758, by a large majority, while a subsequent attempt, the following year, to annul the enactment was resisted by Lord Hardwicke and defeated[1].

There was much in Pitt's conduct on this occasion unworthy of his character. Such unwarrantable and gratuitous attacks upon the King's judges, upon whom depended, far more than upon the Crown, the Parliament or the cabinet, the maintenance of public order and security, and such attempts to lower and degrade their high office were pregnant with mischief and danger. Moreover, he had not scrupled, when he found his measure resolutely opposed, to let the King know through Lady Yarmouth that if the Bill were allowed to pass he would cease his opposition to the King's German subsidies[2]. It is impossible to regard his proceedings as merely inspired by an enthusiasm for right and liberty, applied wrongly and under misapprehension. Lord Lyttelton, indeed, does not hesitate to call Pitt's conduct "one of the blackest and most infamous practices that ever I heard of in all the history of our factions[3]"; and there can be little doubt that these proceedings were but one step or incident in a large premeditated and organised project of increasing his own power and that of his party in the administration, by attacking and undermining that of the Newcastle and Yorke party. In this instance, it had been sought to strike a blow at the great influence and authority held so long by Lord Hardwicke, and now also by Lord Mansfield and Charles Yorke, in Westminster Hall, and to transfer it to Sir Charles Pratt; while at the same time, by means of a clamour raised about liberty, they might be rendered unpopular in the country and lose votes in the House of Commons.

With the same object in view another move was made in the region of diplomacy, in which General Yorke at the Hague, in an embassy which was outside Pitt's control as Secretary for the Southern Department, had shown too much ability and activity, and had acquired too much influence to be agreeable to Pitt and his party. Some attempts had already been made to remove him to less important embassies. He had declined that of Spain,

[1] Below, pp. 54 sqq.; Walpole, *George II*, iii. 182; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 927.
[2] p. 49.
[3] R. Phillimore, *Mem.* 609.

offered him by Pitt in November 1757[1], and, supported by his Father and the King, had avoided the appointment of envoy to the King of Prussia in the place of Mitchell[2]; and had returned to the Hague, after his mission thither, without making any false step, which might have given a handle to his enemies to attack him. A zealous supporter of Pitt's war policy, able and active in his official duties and accustomed hitherto to the full confidence of his superiors, he now found himself excluded from negotiations and left isolated, uninformed and unsupported. He was treated with cold formality by his official chief, the Earl of Holderness[3], a man of weak character and limited abilities, formerly a subservient adherent of the Duke of Newcastle, now a hanger-on of Pitt, and later, as the chief power shifted its position once more, a follower of Lord Bute, who had unfortunately some cause for jealousy of General Yorke, having been superseded in his favour in Holland, where his diplomacy had been *gauche* and unsuccessful[4].

Such a situation was only rendered tolerable or possible by the advice and countenance which he received from his Father, and by the continuance of a correspondence, begun at his first entrance into diplomacy and separate from his official communications, with the Duke of Newcastle who, in return for information which enabled him to maintain his hold upon the control of foreign affairs, from which it was sought to exclude him, and to be the first to entertain the King with news and anecdotes, gave him his support at home[5]. The existence of this correspondence was no secret, and was known both to Lord Holderness and to Pitt[6]. The Duke always insisted on maintaining these separate communications with the agents of the government abroad; and in former

[1] Below, p. 85; H. 9, ff. 209, 225. [2] p. 199.

[3] Robert D'Arcy, fourth Earl of Holderness (1718–78), ambassador at Venice 1744–6, at the Hague 1749–51; Secretary of State 1751–61.

[4] pp. 55–6, 67; N. 212, f. 518; H. 16, ff. 61, 92; H. 70, f. 41; H. 9, f. 3. Lord Holderness was also, it was said, desirous of being appointed Plenipotentiary at the projected Congress at Augsburg and of excluding Joseph Yorke; see p. 72. Moreover, the King had serious thoughts in 1758 of giving his office in the Cabinet to General Yorke. Below, p. 42.

[5] See the D. of N. to J. Y. "You know *who* sees your letters and therefore, as that person does not love to read the same thing over twice, I must beg you would always send me two parts, one (which is to be shewed) with an account of such particulars as you may think proper to send to me and to nobody else, the other with the occurrences which you send in your private letters, etc., to Lord Holderness, as I shall by that means have them *much sooner* than any other way. I know your goodness, I give you a great deal of trouble; but you are able and willing to go through it, when it is to please and serve an old and faithful friend." N. 192, f. 328 and also below, p. 216.

[6] See p. 68.

administrations, this practice had more than once given rise to jealousies and, on some occasions, to the resignation of ministers[1].

It is obvious that such a system might involve serious inconveniences; but it must not be forgotten that the Duke of Newcastle was, by his office, at the head of the administration, and was exercising no more than the right, which every modern Prime Minister would also exact, of being informed of all important transactions and of all negotiations carried on by other members of the Cabinet.

At length, an incident placed it in the power of Pitt and his friends to strike an effectual blow at this source of the Duke of Newcastle's influence and at the same time at General Yorke. As the war went on and the French saw themselves every year placed in a position of greater disadvantage, various projects of peace and proposals for negotiations, more or less genuine and authorised, came from their side, which were generally communicated in the first place to the British Minister at the Hague. Among these was the attempt of a lady, hereafter styled *l'Inconnue*, who wrote under the *nom-de-guerre* of Mme de Beaumer, but who was identified as the Dowager Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst, mother of the Grand Duchess Catherine, later Empress of Russia[2]. She expressed a wish in some letters to General Yorke, dated September 28, and October 1, 1759, from Paris, to enter into communications with him with the object of putting an end to hostilities[3]. In the first she expressed very little but a desire for peace and a horror of war, and in the second she announced her intention of visiting Versailles, and of exerting herself in the cause of peace in which she hoped to secure General Yorke's support. The latter replied in some meaningless, but elegant and well-turned French phrases, beginning: "Madame, ma qualité d'homme me défend de laisser sans réponse les lettres d'une

[1] As for instance Lord Chesterfield, *Letters* (Bradshaw), 849. "Lord Harrington," writes the D. of N. October 30, 1746, to the Duke of Bedford, "complained much of being overruled in his own province, and of my having had a private correspondence with Lord Sandwich, which I did not deny, but said it was in my private capacity and without sending any orders or directions whatever. Lord Chancellor afterwards proposed an expedient, which I thought would have reconciled the difference of opinion," *Bedford Corr.* i. 171; also Coxe's *Pelham*, i. 344 and N. 24, f. 146; also note by the second Lord Hardwicke, H. 66, f. 212: "The Duke of N. had always a private correspondence with the foreign ministers."

[2] According to Walpole, she "was ambitious and passionate for intrigues; she went to Paris, and dabbled in politics with all her might." *Letters*, v. 234.

[3] N. 212, ff. 308, 310; H. 71, ff. 26–31.

dame; ma qualité de ministre public de parler sur des affaires, qui intéressent mon Maître sans sa permission. C'est dans la première qualité que j'ai l'honneur d'accuser la bonne réception de vos deux lettres....Vous dites que le Ciel s'est servi de votre sexe, Madame, pour terminer de grandes affaires. J'en suis d'accord avec vous, Madame; car le Ciel est trop juste envers la Terre pour vouloir que le sexe aimable soit l'instrument de la guerre seulement";...adding however: "Il a tant coûté de sang pour régler les limites dans l'un et l'autre monde, que je doute qu'un seul trait de plume les ajuste."

Further explanations of a more precise character not being forthcoming from the lady, the correspondence came abruptly to a close; and while it was sent to the Duke of Newcastle and shown to Lord Hardwicke and to the King, who was amused and entertained at the incident, it was considered by General Yorke too trivial for mention in his official despatches to the Secretary of State. "To be sure," writes the second Lord Hardwicke, "Sir Joseph in strictness should have taken no notice of the *Inconnue's* letters without leave first obtained; but his answer is so guarded that no advantage could be taken from it[1]."

Meanwhile Pitt, to satisfy Lord Temple and extend his own influence, had for some time been pressing vehemently for the Garter for the latter, which the old King as strongly refused to one, whom he disliked and despised and thought unworthy of the honour. Threats and cajoleries were in vain employed by Pitt to accomplish his object. The King continued to offer a stout resistance notwithstanding Lord Hardwicke and the Duke of Newcastle, who joined their persuasions to induce the King to yield, deeming the sacrifice a small one to make for the advantage of Pitt's cordial co-operation and support, without which it seemed impossible to carry on the war or maintain the administration. Lord Temple, as a sign of displeasure, at last resigned the Privy Seal and retired from the Cabinet, on November 13, 1759, and Pitt withdrew to the country, exhibiting all the marks of resentment and uttering threats of opposition[2].

This was the situation of affairs when the incident of the correspondence between the *Inconnue* and General Yorke came to Lord Holderness's knowledge who, either mistaking its real character or, which is far more probable, perceiving in it an

[1] H. 71, f. 15.

[2] Below, pp. 56 sqq.; *Grenville Papers*, i. 267 sqq.

excellent opportunity of ingratiating himself with Pitt and strengthening the latter's party and at the same time of paying off old scores against a successful rival, poured into the minister's indignant ears the story of a separate and secret negotiation with France on the subject of peace, undertaken without his knowledge and without his orders by the minister at the Hague, and with the treacherous connivance of the Duke of Newcastle[1].

Pitt's anger, which it is scarcely possible to avoid suspecting was a little simulated and paraded for party purposes,—for it is difficult to believe that he could have remained in entire ignorance of the real facts,—was, in appearance at least, unbounded; and produced a letter in his most haughty and characteristic style[2], announcing his intention to resign his office, when such encroachments upon his province and responsibilities were permitted*. The unfortunate Duke of Newcastle cowered before the storm, and terrified at the possible consequences, allowed at first the whole weight of Pitt's resentment to fall on the ambassador at the Hague. He took care not to own that the correspondence with himself had been carried on by his express orders, and declared that he had "been sorry" when the letters of the *Inconnue* had been sent to him. Moreover, he acquiesced in a further hostile move against General Yorke, made by Lord Holderness, and consented to his exclusion from a negotiation with France, then undertaken and

[1] Cf. Walpole's (*George II*, iii. 235) inaccurate account of the incident, which he calls an "event of éclat"—"General Yorke at the Hague had received some anonymous proposals of peace and had transmitted them to his father, who communicated them to the Duke of Newcastle; the latter mentioned them to Knyphausen, the Prussian minister, who, though enjoined to secrecy, revealed them to Lord Holderness. The latter, who had quitted Newcastle for Pitt, instantly carried the intelligence to his new patron. Pitt enraged to find a kind of negotiation carrying on without the participation of either Secretary, reproached Newcastle in warm terms. The latter threw the blame on General Yorke." See also Knyphausen and Michel, the Prussian ministers, who were often misinformed, to the K. of Prussia, November 6, 1759: "Nous ne sommes point instruits avec précision de ce qui s'est passé à cet égard, mais nous sommes informés positivement que le Roi s'est réservé à lui-même et à son ministre allemand le secret de quelques-unes de ces insinuations, que d'autres ont été confiées au Duc de Newcastle à l'insu du Chevalier Pitt." (*Politische Corr. F.'s des Grossen*, xviii. 644; below, pp. 75, 148 *n.*) There is no evidence whatever of the "chipotages" attributed here to the Duke of Newcastle, or of any bad faith on his part or of any clandestine negotiations for peace, which, indeed, could not possibly, in the circumstances, have served any purpose. Cf. Ruville's *Pitt* (1907), ii. 285, 290, who has been misled by the quotation above as to the character of the letters.

[2] pp. 66–9.

* Mr Pitt, who always loved a *querelle d'Allemagne* and was out of humour about the Garter, blew it up into a storm. It was more near to overset the administration than anything that had happened. H. H. 71, f. 15.

begun by Prince Louis of Brunswick at the Hague, by order of the British Ministers.

Lord Hardwicke, however, was by no means ready to put up with the slight and the unmerited reproaches cast upon his son. Though suffering at this time from a serious illness, he supported and defended him with great vigour, and took no pains to conceal his indignation and resentment.

"[*Endorsed by Lord Hardwicke.*] *Considerations relating to Major General Yorke*[1].

"*Objections*: 1. The not at first avowing and openly declaring that this *private correspondence* was begun and carried on by the Duke of Newcastle's command and authority, with the King's privity and approbation, and under His Majesty's inspection.

"2. The expression in the Duke of Newcastle's first letter to Mr Pitt, viz. 'I was sorry when they (*i.e.* the two letters from *l'Inconnue*) were sent to me.' This imports a condemnation of what Major General Yorke had done, and is directly contrary to the whole tenor and import of the Duke of Newcastle's first letter to Lord Hardwicke on this subject, dated October 15th 1759[2].

"3. The Duke of Newcastle's giving way to, and laying hold of, the colour thrown out by Mr Pitt, 'That Major General Yorke had writ an answer to *l'Inconnue*, before he had communicated the letters here.' This appears to have been a mere colour and pretence to make the Duke of Newcastle think himself the less concerned. This his Grace has fallen in with and adopted, though the answer is most innocent and sans consequence, and might be printed in the *London Chronicle* or posted up upon the Royal Exchange. Neither the Duke of Newcastle nor anybody else thought of such an objection, nor does Lord Holderness give the least hint of it in his letter to Major General Yorke, dated 23rd October 1759[3].

"From the time of the Duke of Newcastle falling in with this objection, Major General Yorke appears to have been *given up*.

"4. The Duke of Newcastle agreeing to leave Major General Yorke (tho' the King's minister *at the Hague*) entirely out of the knowledge and transaction of the declaration to be made to the ministers of the Courts of Vienna and Versailles *at the Hague*, expressly ordering it to be kept a secret from him, tho' positively

[1] H. 71, f. 72.
[2] p. 65. [3] p. 70.

directed to be communicated to almost every other of the King's ministers abroad. And tho' His Majesty proposed and was desirous that it should be communicated to Major General Yorke, the Duke of Newcastle himself dissuaded His Majesty from it and prevented it.

"5. Thus this affair is left, and is the strongest *reprimand* and *condemnation in fact*, stronger than any words, that could be found out.

"The Duke of Newcastle's subsequent letters to Major General Yorke give him no kind of information of the state of the affair.

"*Conduct.* Not to set my foot within the House of Lords; nor to go near the Court; nor to meddle in any public business till satisfaction is given to me in this affair.

"Never to meet with, nor have anything more to do with, Lord Holderness.

"To consider in what events, and at what time, Major General Yorke should write *to be recalled.*

"*Mem.* Some prudential considerations on the other side."

He brought the matter to the King's notice and obtained from the Sovereign a full approbation of his son's conduct, and a command that the correspondence should be continued. The Duke of Newcastle was compelled by his representations and by the fear of losing his support to undertake General Yorke's defence. Meanwhile, Lord Temple had offered an apology to the King, who had at last yielded to the wishes of his ministers. He received a promise of the Garter and returned to his office in the Cabinet. As had been foreseen, Pitt's attitude changed immediately. He now, on November 18, sought an interview with Lord Hardwicke, when the whole matter was discussed and explained apparently to his complete satisfaction. A meeting of the ministers was summoned at which Pitt did General Yorke full, though tardy, justice; and in spite of Lord Holderness's opposition, instructions were sent to Prince Louis of Brunswick, in accordance with a memorandum dictated by Lord Hardwicke, directing him to proceed in the negotiation in concert with the King's envoy at the Hague. The King of Prussia, moreover, on hearing of the incident, sent General Yorke a personal assurance of his regard and of his continued confidence. To the weak and treacherous minister, who had attempted his son's ruin and who had affected surprise at the altered bearing observed towards him, Lord Hardwicke addressed a scathing letter of contemptuous

reproach[1]. The incident then closed, but not without leaving some feelings of bitterness and a sense of injustice in General Yorke, who had been made the victim, all through this strange transaction, of the ambition and intrigues of others. He continued to be treated with neglect by his principal, and Pitt's final letter to him was cold and reserved and seemed to seek to impose an obligation for a supposed favour[2].

On several occasions Pitt showed an arrogance, an egotism, and a surprising want of generosity towards his fellow-ministers. "Mr Pitt," wrote Walpole, "assumed everything to himself but the disposition of the money. That load he left to the Treasury.... He *does* everything, the Duke of Newcastle *gives* everything.... He affected to throw on the Treasury the execution of measures which he dictated, but for which he thus held himself not responsible. The conduct...to him proved most advantageous.... Misfortunes and miscarriages fell to the account of [others]." He reaped all the glory of the victories, and in announcing them to Parliament it was his custom "with great address," and by some turns of oratory in which he was so great a master, while "seeming to waive any merit," to "state our success in a manner that excluded all others from a share in it[3]."

In particular, he sought to throw all the responsibility and unpopularity for the heavy national expenditure upon the Duke of Newcastle and the Treasury, an attempt which met with Lord Hardwicke's indignation, and which was repelled by the Duke with great firmness and justice. The Duke refused to bring any demand before Parliament, which had not the approval of Pitt and the Cabinet. It was "the business of the King's ministers," he very properly declared in a letter to Pitt of April 5, 1758, "collectively to say whether the measure shall be pursued or not[4]." In 1759,

[1] p. 82.

[2] pp. 42, 65 sqq., 106; H. 37, f. 136; R. O., State Pap. Holland, November 20th, 1759; Ruville's *Pitt* (1907), ii. 285 sqq.; *Chatham Corr.* i. 359 sqq., 433 sqq.; *Grenville Papers*, i. 272–80, 331, 337; Mitchell MSS. Add. 6832, f. 234; Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, iii. 483.

[3] *Letters*, iv. 218; *George II*, iii. 173, 224.

[4] H. 71, f. 177; N. 205, f. 182; N. 194, ff. 46, 60, 76; *Chatham Corr.* i. 302 sqq. See also *e.g.* Pitt's provocative letter to the D. of N. March 29th, 1758, asking for a prebend for the chaplain of the H. of Commons. "I, knowing my entire inability to do *this mighty matter*, beg leave to rest it with your Grace upon the justice and decency of the pretension. As I have not had one word to say upon Hierarchys and Powers, I would fain hope that I might be indulged an humble Prebend in the name of the Commons of England," and the D. of N.'s good-humoured reply granting it. N. 193, ff. 420, 433.

with the same view, Pitt declared the estimates for the Continental war to be excessive, and appealed in a circular letter to his Tory followers, with whom such expenditure was always unpopular, on account of their former pledges and protestations. He opposed the increase of the sugar tax demanded by the Treasury, but which "touched the vitals" of his zealous supporter in the City, Alderman Beckford, upon whom he pronounced in the House of Commons a strange and ridiculous eulogy[1].

Such conduct was in no way calculated to advance the national cause or to maintain good relations, especially with a minister so jealous and sensitive as the Duke of Newcastle. But the paramount necessity of union of which both parties were now absolutely convinced, and the strength of Lord Hardwicke's influence, constantly and zealously exercised to mitigate dissensions and to keep the balance of power, were sufficient to prevent a breach[2]. "The Duke of Newcastle and Mr Pitt," wrote Lord Chesterfield, "jog on like man and wife; that is, seldom agreeing, often quarrelling, but by mutual interest, upon the whole, not parting[3]."

Lord Hardwicke himself, unmoved by incidents such as these, persevered steadily in that course of policy and conduct which he had marked out for himself; and so firm was his resolution, that the indignation occasioned by the attack upon the judges and by the conspiracy against his son did not move him to reprisals, or cause him to alter his attitude in the slightest degree[4]. He continued to give his support to Pitt except in measures, such as those already described, incompatible, in his opinion, with the essential interests of the nation. He offered no resistance to the increase of power in the administration which rightly fell to Pitt at this time, dissuaded the Duke of Newcastle from the vain attempt to govern the House of Commons without him, and supported in the general interest some measures, such as the bestowal on Lord Temple of the Garter, with which he had little sympathy. To use his own words, "He winked at many things for the sake of union[5]." He consented to others, such as the Militia Bill, which, brought in at first under popular auspices had, on being put into execution, proved an extremely unpopular measure. The people complained of the bad faith of the government, which had despatched men on service abroad

[1] Walpole, *George II*, iii. 177.

[2] pp. 31, 38 sqq.

[3] *Letters* (Bradshaw), 1221.

[4] For instance he received a long visit from Pitt on December 17th, 1759, when a great number of points relating to public business were discussed. N. 215, f. 141.

[5] Quoted by Walpole, *George II*, iii. 280.

contrary to the clear conditions of their enlistment, a charge which was only too true. The omission of the provision for pay in the Act, and the burden which it placed upon one class of the community, and that the poorest class, formed other substantial grievances. In a few years those counties, which had adopted it, grew tired of the expense. The attempt to execute the Act led to dangerous riots all over England, and necessitated the exercise of force by the regular troops to carry it out. Such a situation, Lord Hardwicke pointed out to the ministers, was an absurdity. It was impossible to compel men to take oaths. Force could not possibly attain the end in view. It was raising a rebellion to raise a militia[1]. The best course to take was to postpone the enlistments, and make some concessions to the popular feeling[2].

He acquiesced in another measure, the further arming of the Highlanders, which he regarded with some anxiety. This was no "new and daring experiment," as it has often been misrepresented, inaugurated by the genius of Pitt. Highlanders had been enlisted as early as 1725. In 1739 a whole regiment had been raised, the 43rd, afterwards renamed the 42nd, which greatly distinguished itself at Fontenoy and in the campaign at Flanders. It was later included in the force sent out under Abercromby in 1756 and landed in New York in June, some time before Pitt's administration was formed in December.

It was not therefore the enlistment of the Highlanders for foreign service, of which Lord Hardwicke especially disapproved, but rather their employment at home, under the chiefs of the clans and in large numbers. "Nothing could more effectually break in upon the plan, which has been pursuing for that country ever since the last Rebellion," he wrote to the Duke of Newcastle, "and I dare say the scheme is to put an end to it." To raise a regiment out of the Gordon clan, as was proposed, would, in his opinion, be raising a regiment for the Pretender[3]. The command of a battalion given to one attainted for his part in the rebellion, Simon Fraser, son of

[1] pp. 32 sqq.; N. 188, f. 470.

[2] See p. 53, and above, vol. ii. 261 sqq.; H. 3, ff. 402–432; H. 4, ff. 5, 19, 26; H. 331, f. 236; *Bedford Corr.* ii. 267, 385; *Chatham Corr.* i. 257; *Chesterfield's Letters* (Bradshaw), 1177; also *Walpole's Letters*, iv. 96. "George Townshend, the promoter of it for popularity, sees it...most unpopular in his own county." He sent a challenge to Lord Leicester for having spoken lightly of the Militia. H. 545, ff. 198 sqq. According to Walpole (*George II*, iii. 40), the failure of the Act in 1757 was owing to "Lord Hardwicke and the Lords," who "had clogged it with impracticabilities, absurdities and hardships," but he is alone in this statement, which has no foundation.

[3] N. 208, f. 271.

the notorious Lord Lovat, who had himself been entrusted with a regiment of Highlanders by the King's government and had played so treacherous and dangerous a part in 1745, not unnaturally struck him especially as an act of imprudence. It was throwing great power into his hands, raising again the clan system, and exciting once more the roving and fighting spirit, which had hitherto been the curse of Scotland[1]. He reminded Pitt of the desertion of Lord Loudoun's regiment of Highlanders raised in 1744, with nearly all the officers and men, to the Pretender[2]. Abroad, however, he thought they might do well. "I believe they may fight in Flanders," he had written in 1746[3]. To Lord Breadalbane, who wrote that they must be commanded by their own officers and be allowed the Highland dress, he declared his acquiescence only on the ground of necessity[4]. He seemed to agree with Pitt, who said that they would be useful in North America and not many come back[5].

These apprehensions, and the recalling of these unfavourable incidents, already, even at that time, so close to the events in question, no more than old memories, were really unnecessary. But Lord Hardwicke was unconscious of the greatness of his own handiwork, and did not realise the completeness of its success, or the extent and rapidity of the changes which had resulted from it. In the end, the project of creating a militia in Scotland itself, of which he disapproved, was rejected[6]. But two new battalions of 1000 Highlanders each, with 300 men as reserves, were raised by Pitt for service in America[7], where, together with those sent abroad before them, fighting for the empire, instead of in the cause of petty and half barbarous chieftains of a tribe, or in the service of the enemies of England, and often deciding the issue of the combat by their bravery, physical strength and obedience to orders, they fulfilled in the highest sense the aim of the great policy, which had been inaugurated in Scotland[8].

[1] Vol. ii. 383.

[2] Vol. ii. 378. See also the curious account of the revolt of the Highland regiment in 1743 and their capture at Northampton. J. Browne, *Hist. of the Highlands* (1845), iv. 133 sqq.

[3] Vol. i. 517.

[4] H. 102, ff. 261–273, see also H. 101, f. 133.

[5] Vol. ii. 378; cf. Wolfe, who advocated their employment in Nova Scotia. "They are hardy, intrepid, accustomed to a rough country, and no great mischief if they fall"; quoted *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xvii. 466.

[6] See below, pp. 109, 346; H. 530, f. 106; Walpole, *George II*, iii. 280; G. W. T. Omond, *Arniston Mem.* 163; Clode, i. 42; *Autobiography of A. Carlyle*, 399.

[7] James Browne, *Hist. of the Highlands* (1845), iv. 133 sqq.; Walpole, *George II*, ii. 300; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 83; J. W. Fortescue, *Hist. of the British Army*, ii. 49, 300; *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xvii. 466.

[8] Above, vol. i. chap. xvii.; Ramsay, *Scotland and Scotsmen*, ii. 504.

Correspondence

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 29; N. 188, f. 239.]

Newcastle House, *August* 23, 1757.

[Returns his thanks to Lord Hardwicke for coming to town and for his able and efficient help on all occasions. But as he is now so often away in the country, he finds himself entirely alone in the Cabinet, whenever he is of a different opinion to Mr Pitt. Could not Lord Mansfield be called to the Cabinet to support him[1]?] I now come to the main point, viz.: Mr Pitt's present disposition and future conduct in the administration. Your Lordship knows the little vivacities which have passed, and the *no* foundation there was for them. I hope we shall have no more of them. I am sure I shall give no occasion for them, and if they do happen and don't go further than they have done, I will endeavour to forget them as soon as I have done those which have passed. You will say what you think proper on the subject [to Pitt on his coming interview with him]....Mr Pitt shall have his full share of power and credit, but he shall not be *my superior*. He owes to me in great measure his civil reception at Court; that I shall endeavour to improve most sincerely, and that alteration makes it the more necessary for me to be upon my guard. I will not trouble your Lordship now upon the Speech, but as *that* is (and is so called by Mr Pitt) the plan of government and of the Session, the substance of it must come from *our shop*. I wish I had taken the wise and great part your Lordship has done, viz. to do what service I could to the King and the Country, and not involve myself in the disagreeable incidents that must attend my present situation....Is it impossible for you to stay till Friday? Send me by Jones an account of your conference.

Ever yours,

...

Holles Newcastle.

[On August 30, 1757 (H. 11, f. 399), Lord Anson complains to Lord Hardwicke of the Duke of Newcastle's refusal to appoint Sir Edward Hawke to the Board of Admiralty[2], and of his filling up appointments with "persons of no use there and of no weight or abilities elsewhere"; he threatens to resign, and begs for Lord Hardwicke's intervention.]

[1] This was finally effected, notwithstanding some opposition at first from Pitt, through Lord H.'s influence. H. 69, ff. 57, 59; Walpole, *George II*, iii. 80.

[2] Lord Hardwicke had hoped to include Hawke on the formation of the administration, but had not succeeded, probably owing to Pitt's dislike.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Solicitor-General

[H. 5, f. 222.] WIMPOLE, *Sept. 8th*, 1757.

DEAR CHARLES,

...We are here in the midst of tumults and confusion. Some people are in danger of being thought as bad judges of what is *popular* as of what is *right*; for this very popular bill turns out to be the most unpopular measure that I ever knew. And this, without any industry amongst the upper sort of people to raise it, but merely from the flame catching amongst the lower sort, farmers, mechanics and labourers.

You have heard what has passed in Bedfordshire, more of which is still threatened; and your brother did yesterday, thro' my hands, send an express to Lord Barrington for some soldiers to be sent to Ampthill and Clophill before next Monday, when some meetings are to be in the sub-divisions to take the subscriptions of the men drawn by the lots. He tells me he does not find that there is any personal resentment against him, as he has hardly meddled in the militia[1]; but he fears the mobs may turn to plundering and exacting contributions, as they have already done in some places. And this is true; for on Monday last a meeting being appointed at Royston for that division of Hertfordshire, to draw the lots, the mob of Hertfordshire came in, and, as is said, increased from about 400 to near 800 at last; broke up the meeting, compelled the gentlemen to deliver up to them the lists returned, and the tickets, and to give their words that they would act no more in the affair. Mr Jennings of Newsalls did not act but was there, and so was a kind of mediator. They went that evening to Sir John Chapman's and Mr Hassell's; attacked their houses, broke all the windows of the former and some of the latter, and compell'd them to give them money, and all the drink in their cellars. It was said that they intended to make me a visit to-day; but I am now told that they say I am a very good man, that I threw the bill out of the House of Lords last year and would not let it pass, and therefore they won't hurt a hair of my head. How true either the one or the other is, I will not answer for.

But this is become a very serious affair. I understand there is to be a meeting of the King's servants upon it to-night, and possibly

[1] Lord Royston writes to his Father on July 27th, 1758, that he endeavours to "observe a due medium between a violent zeal and a languid coldness with regard to this nice and difficult project." H. 4, f. 21.

you may be advised with. I have writ my opinion to the Duke of Newcastle. Nobody can have a greater detestation than I have, of laws being repealed or set aside by popular dissent and violence. But this is a law, which it is impossible to cram down the people's throats by force. You can never raise a militia by the compulsion of a standing army; in order to [do] it you may raise a rebellion in the view of raising a militia, to suppress rebellion. All this is absurd. It differs from other cases. Troops may suppress riots and keep the people quiet through fear. Troops may defend and keep up a turnpike. But, in this instance, the final acts are to be done by the people themselves personally. They are to *subscribe* their names and *take oaths* before the Deputy Lieutenants. No force can make them do that, if they stand out; nor can anybody do it for them. They may indeed be convicted, and be imprisoned or fined for their refusal, but is it possible to imprison or prosecute 1000 or 500 men in a county at once? Possibly some may propose the issuing of a proclamation to declare the law, and enforce the execution of it; but in my opinion, that would only make things worse and commit the government still more. The proclamation will be waste paper. Force must support it at last; and force is inadequate in the present case.

Under these circumstances, and as nothing can now be completed for use, my way of thinking is (and so I have told the Duke of Newcastle[1]) that it will be most prudent and advisable to gain time; for which end it may be intimated to the Lord Lieutenants and their Deputies to adjourn their meeting to some long day, as has been done here; and indeed in this county and in many others it may be unavoidable, for so long as all the returns are not brought in, or are forced out of their hands by the populace, the Deputy Lieutenants cannot possibly settle the proportion of men upon the several hundreds and parishes, as the act directs. If this is done the Parliament will probably meet early in November, and then the subject may be reconsidered and possibly the bill be new modelled into some more practicable shape. If nobody was wiser than I, this should be the provisional measure. The present situation of foreign affairs is a further reason to prevent the growth of these tumults. They will be represented abroad as insurrections, perhaps as a rebellion; at least as disaffection and aversion to assist or serve the government, and great advantage made of it by our enemies.

[1] N. 188, ff. 470, 510.

I will now tell you what objections that great reasoner, the mob, goes upon.

1. That they are to serve, on the days of exercise, without pay; and indeed there being no clause for it in the act, nobody can satisfy them that they are to be allowed any. I always thought it wrong not to insert that provision.

2. That when they are drawn by lots and raised, they shall some time or other be sent to serve out of the Kingdom.

When they are told that there is an express clause in the act to prohibit it, they reply that they give no credit to that; for that the men raised in Huntingdonshire, and in Devonshire and Somersetshire, in the spring [of] 1756, were absolutely promised that they should be listed only for 3 years and not sent abroad, and yet some of them were soon after sent to North America. I fear this is too true; and I always thought it excessively wrong.

3. Their third objection goes a little deeper, and must have been put into their heads by somebody. They say the former law laid the burden and charge upon the nobility and gentry and men of property; that this takes it off from them and turns it upon the lower people, who are to live by their labour; and as they connect this with their being allowed no pay by the act, they say it is taking away so much of their bread. I own I have sometimes thought of this, tho' I never mentioned it; but it has brought to my mind the bargain, which the nobility and gentry made with the Crown soon after the Restoration, when they purchased out their own burdens by the tenures and wardships by laying an excise upon beer and ale to be consum'd by the common people; for those liquors, when brewed in private houses, are not subjected to it.

I have now told you all I know of the fact upon this very disagreeable subject, and the whole of my way of thinking about it. If you like any part of it, you may possibly have some occasion to make use of it....

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 3, f. 407.] WIMPOLE, Friday night, *Sept. 9th*, 1757.

DEAR ROYSTON,

I despatch this messenger in order to enquire how you all do....

As to affairs here, they have been in a very violent state. I told you what passed on Monday at Royston by a Hertfordshire mob.

Yesterday a Cambridgeshire mob assembled from Steeple-Morden, Guilden-Morden, Littlington, Bassingbourne, Melbourne and Meldreth; and about eleven o'clock I received an express from Mr Nightingale that they were at his house to the number of a 1000, and that they declared they would come to Wimpole; and that he and Mr Janeway, Lord Sandys's bailiff and one of the high constables, would come up to me as soon as they could get away. Having but a weak garrison, I immediately determin'd to give up my outworks, and to throw open my park gates, that they might not be provoked to break down my pales; to leave open the gates of the stable and kitchen courts; but to shut up those of the great court, and all the doors and window shutters of my house, leaving the glass windows to their discretion; and I resolved to have gone out to them, and to have spoke to them in the most proper manner I could; for I knew several of my own tenants from Steeple-Morden were probably amongst them. But neither the Insurgents, as the Scotch called the Rebel Highlanders, nor my allies, came near me; and I was afterwards informed that after they had got a little money from Mr Nightingale, and were satisfied he had not the lists—(which was their great demand) they went to Melbourne, expecting a Petty Sessions there for licensing. Finding there was no such Sessions, they went to Lady Hatton's, insulted her house and got a little money of her, and from thence march'd towards Royston to get the lists from Mr Wortham, or otherwise to pull down his house. They compell'd the two chief constables of Royston division to march along with them, and forc'd all the labouring men they met in their way to join them, which induc'd me to send away Mr Plumptre's workmen and the few labourers I had at work, that they might be out of their way. In their march over the fields from Melbourne to Royston, they spied the two troops of Horse coming down the hill to Royston. At first, some of the mob swagger'd, and did not value them a farthing; but by degrees, their spirits failed; many deserted, especially the press'd men; but the rest, to the number, it is said, of about 500, wherein I believe they include women and children, went on to Mr Wortham's house, and demanded the lists with threats. In that very moment the two troops of the Blues marched into the street and drew up before Wortham's door. Capt. Kellett, the commanding officer, got off his horse and went amongst them; talked to them in a very reasonable but firm manner. However, nothing would satisfy them but having the lists delivered up, as the

Hertfordshire gentlemen had done on Monday, and then they would go home quietly. Mr Wortham assur'd them he had not the lists, and so far was proper; but he went further and told them they were in the hands of Mr Swale at Mildenhall, which was wrong. They declared they would have the lists in a week, and so dispersed. The names of the ringleaders were, as I am told, taken down in writing. I have been since inform'd that they declare they intend me no harm; for that I am a very good man, and last year, when I was Chancellor, threw the bill out of the House, and would not have let it come in again, if I could have help'd it. And I don't find they have any particular resentment against you; but they fancy that you, being Lord Lieutenant, either have the lists or can order them to be deliver'd up, and they enquir'd whether you were here, in order to have come hither to demand them. I have taken some care to have it propagated that you was as much against the bill as I was; but it is now a law; and that you have no lists, nor have any power to order them to be deliver'd up. Indeed, by Mr Wortham's hastiness, they now know where they are; *aliquisque malo fuit usus in illo*; for by that they know that you have them not. I writ a letter last night to Capt. Kellett, who seems to be a very sensible man, and is to be commended for his expedition; for he march'd from Cheshunt that morning and came in the critical minute. I have invited him to dine with me. Everything has been very quiet to-day; and, I suppose, whilst the soldiers stay, this valiant militia will be intimidated....

I hope to hear that nothing has happen'd to frighten my Lady Marchioness or the children. Mr Heathcote and Lady Margaret left us this morning, tho' I told them we could not spare so many of our garrison; but I believe they were not sorry to get out of this state of hostility. After things are quieted, I intend to make some enquiry about my people at Morden. I have fed and maintained these wretches, and many more of them, all the last winter, during their distress, and this is the return they make. I fear the farmers encourage them in these disorders, and that most of our own servants are on their side, for they none of them like to be *lotted*....

Your mother is very well, and has good spirits enough for garrison duty. She joins with me in our most affectionate compliments,... and longs to hear of your being safe and quiet. I writ last Sunday to Mr Wray[1] to invite him to this place, but I fear he does not like

[1] See vol. i. pp. 208, 213 *n*.

to put himself into a town that may be besieg'd. I have heard nothing of Charles by this post.

I am,

Most affectionately yours,

HARDWICKE[1].

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 189, f. 1.] *Sept. 11th*, 1757.

...Perhaps the resolution to let things take their natural course, and leave the magistrates to proceed as they judge proper may be the rightest, at least for the present. But then those magistrates must not be blamed for what they shall determine according to the best of their judgments upon the circumstances of their respective counties. Mr Pitt is much mistaken in thinking that the disorders have proceeded from want of a proper disposition in the Lord Lieutenants and Deputy Lieutenants to explain the act and enforce it[2]. *The whole* began in Bedfordshire, and the infection has been merely communicated from thence. The great patron and support of the bill in the House of Lords is Lieutenant of that County[3], and Mr Potter, the Chairman of the Committee in the House of Commons, the most active Deputy Lieutenant there; and no activity, explanations, or persuasions have been wanting....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 189, f. 144.] *September 19th*, 1757.

...[Further riots in all parts of the country had taken place.] Though I was originally against the bill, yet now it is a law, I talk as much for it and against the opposition to the execution of it as anyone. But I cannot say with effect. It is a mistake to say that the common people dislike it, because they don't know what it is. It is true that they don't comprehend the train of political argument, on which it depends, and never will; but they know what is in it, and profess to dislike it for what is *contained in it*, and what is omitted out of it....

[1] Further on this topic H. 3, f. 410; H. 5, f. 226 and cf. correspondence between Lord Poulett and Pitt to the same effect, *Chatham MSS.* 53.

[2] He had declared himself of this opinion at a meeting of the Cabinet, N. 188, f. 541.

[3] Duke of Bedford.

[N. 190, f. 289; H. 69, f. 137.]

[On October 27, 1757 (N. 190, f. 289) the Duke of Newcastle writes to Lord Hardwicke to desire that he will draw up the Speech from the Throne, which he does not want Mr Pitt to do, and nobody but Lord Hardwicke and his authority can prevent it. Unless Lord Hardwicke, after this Session, agrees to take some active station of weight and credit, it will be impossible for him to go on.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 190, f. 315.] WIMPOLE, Saturday, *Oct. 29th*, 1757.

...I have no scruple to declare that I think him [Pitt] extremely ambitious and that his aim is supreme ministerial power, whereof he may possibly fancy that he sees a nearer prospect from what has unfortunately happened with regard to the Duke of Cumberland[1]. I think at the same time that he has a sense of honour, and so far a sense of his own interest, as to see, what he must have learnt by experience, that he cannot go on without the assistance of your Grace and your friends, and that the present situation of affairs makes this more necessary than ever. He is certainly at present greatly affected by the failure of his own two great projects[2], and by a sensibility that he shall be forced to defend himself by the like kind of arguments, which he has exploded and run down in the case of those who have gone before him. And this I do not wonder at, but these reflections must make him sometimes peevish and subject to variations. Your Grace says, "You cannot submit to act a subordinate part, but that you have as much desire and as firm a resolution to manage and (to use the new word) coax him, and see the absolute necessity of it, as much as anybody." This is all that can be desired, or any friend of yours can advise you to. But at the same time it cannot be disguised that the avowal and appearance of the same sole power in your Grace in the House of Commons is not to be expected. All sorts of persons there have concurred in battering down that notion, and the precedents of my Lord Godolphin's and my Lord Sunderland's time have been overruled by the long habits of seeing Sir Robert Walpole and Mr Pelham there, which go as far back as the memory of most people

[1] The Duke of Cumberland, it will be remembered, was the great patron and supporter of Fox, and had now been disgraced after the Convention of Klosterseven. (See below, p. 122.)

[2] The ill-success of the expedition to Rochefort, which had returned without effecting anything on October 6th; and the failure of the Militia Bill.

now sitting there, or indeed now in business, reaches. Upon this foot I think you may go on together, as well as the unhappy circumstances of the present time and affairs will permit any persons to do. But nothing will contribute more to this than to avoid, as much as possible, all expostulations, either between yourselves or through the medium of third persons. They seldom do good; and the true way of avoiding occasions of them is by easy and confidential communications and conversations previously had between yourselves. I would apply this to the immediate question about *the Speech.* It is my sincere opinion and advice that your Grace should enter into an easy and confidential conversation with him about the general turn and outlines of it....

I think the question, who shall lay it before the King, is more material than who shall have the drawing of it, and this only in point of precedent. Possibly Mr Pitt may expect to do it as Secretary of State. Sir Robert Walpole used to do it as Head of the Treasury, all the while I was Chancellor; whether he did it in my Lord Townshend's time I don't know. In your brother's time, your Grace did it whilst Secretary of State, and whilst at the Head of the Treasury, you did the same.

[He cannot possibly come to town on Thursday or before Saturday.] But upon this occasion, permit me with freedom, but with great respect and deference to your Grace, to open my heart to you. I am confident I need not assure you that I am most cordially devoted to your service; but if upon every occasion of Mr Pitt's being necessary to be talked to, or supposed to be so, I am to come out of the country, to leave the place where my private business or convenience engages me for the present to reside, it will be impossible for me to go through it. I am naturally pretty stationary; and when I am settled in town, I remain there and am seldom out of the way. Pray don't be angry with me for adding a word more. Your Grace says, "Mr Pitt will yield to me, and nobody but I can ever propose such things to him." That he will yield to me I am far from seeing reason to admit; but this I am sure of, that if I am to be the person constantly employed to expostulate, that cord will be broke by overstraining it. Nor could I be easy in such a situation, to be perpetually the middle man; and yet I will decline nothing that is proper for me, and which I shall be convinced is for your Grace's service.

I forbear to observe upon what your Grace says, "that I suffered you to come into this galley without me, etc." You know how all

that passed, the advice which I then humbly presumed to give you, the difficulties, the ill-success and responsibility which I foresaw, not indeed in the very shape they have turned out (for I had not the gift of prophecy), but I did not augur much better. Your Grace also knows that there was no "active station of weight and credit" which I could possibly have taken, except my old place, which I took the liberty to tell you from the beginning I could not take again. And I refer myself to your great candour whether, after near twenty years slavery in it, and at the age of near 67, I ought not to be excused for not having returned to that galley again....Don't be angry with me, my dearest Lord, but be assured I am, with the greatest zeal and fidelity,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 192, f. 7; H. 69, f. 170.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Jan. 3rd*, 1758.

[The King had unexpectedly made a demand of £200,000 for forage, said to have been furnished to the Hessian and Prussian troops, and was extremely incensed at the Duke of Newcastle's refusal to pay it. He had said that] we wished him to spend all his money, to ruin himself and to do nothing then for him; that our America, our Lakes, our Mr Amherst[1], might ruin us or make us rich, but in all events he should be undone. His Majesty wanted this money to be sent away in 24 hours. I told him this holiday time nobody was in town, no office open; that caused very severe reflections. [Mr Pitt had been very angry at this demand, and declared that it was impossible to go on on this footing; that the King spoiled his own business; that he himself enjoyed no confidence; that "he was the first man in his station who answered for so much, who had not the least support or assistance from the King,"] and then ran on in his former style of his having no power....That he had told a Dr Moreton, who came to him about the Deanery of Chester, that he had no credit in those things, that he must get himself recommended to the Duke of Newcastle....Upon the whole, such treatment in the Closet, such unreasonable demands...such an inflexibility in Mr Pitt...and above all, such an inward dissatisfaction at not having the appearances of all the power in the disposition of employments, though hitherto there has not been one given, either civil or ecclesiastical, but by him or with his consent, I say all these things, put together, make me quite weary and think very seriously of getting out at the end of the Session. I see I shall be able to do little or no good, and I am cut to pieces between the King and

[1] The officer appointed to provide for the forage.

Mr Pitt. I wish you would seriously attend to this, my present situation....

I cannot conclude without wishing your Lordship all the health, happiness and satisfaction with many happy years, that your love of your country, your ability in its service, your goodness to mankind in general, and above all your steadiness and warm heart to your friends, deserve. I speak feelingly on the subject, and am unalterably yours,

... HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 185, f. 30.] MOOR PARK, *Jan. 4th*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD,

...Your Grace may be assured that I very seriously attend to everything that concerns your situation. Everything that makes you uneasy, makes me so; but I entreat your Grace not to suffer every incident of this kind to make a deep impression. The Closet has always been subject to great fluctuations, and passion grows stronger as other faculties grow weaker, especially under such burdens as do now really oppress *us*. But, in the present case *money* was the object, and whoever serves the King in the department of his *money*, as they may have some more opportunities to please him, will also, especially in such times as these, have more occasions to displease him. But this disposition is so strange and yet so rooted, that I will say no more upon it, except what Tully says in his tract, *De Senectute. Potest quicquam esse absurdius quam quo minus viae restat, eo plus viatici quaerere?* I verily believe Lady Y[armouth] is in the right, that there is no other cause for the ill-humour, in this instance, except the disappointment about the money....

[Nor should the Duke attach too much importance to Pitt's discourse.]

I cannot sufficiently thank you for all your kind wishes to me. What befalls me is of very little consequence to anybody but myself. My race is run, and I have nothing to exert but my sincere and hearty affection and attachment to my friends. Your prayers for me are the more disinterested, but mine for you include the King and this Country....

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 192, f. 49; H. 69, f. 177.] CLAREMONT, *Jan. 7th*, 1758.

...The King complained very much to me the other day of my Lord Holderness, his negligence in his business, his non-attention, etc.; Lady Yarmouth spoke of it afterwards with great emotion....

But I am sure you will be surprized when you hear that the person the King thinks on for Secretary of State is my good friend Joe*. I don't mention this at all as if it was likely to happen, but it shows to a great degree the justice the King does to his ability, his zeal and his attention to his service, and indeed they are all *very great*. The last letter I sent your Lordship from him (of which you say nothing) is a most admirable one, and I really believe his letters to me have been of service to him.

[H. 69, f. 181.]

[On January 12, 1758, the Duke of Newcastle, being detained indoors by a cold, desires Lord Hardwicke to speak to Lord Bute on the subject of the appointments to the Bedchamber, and also to Mr Pitt about the successor to Mr Legge as Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had declared his intention of resigning[1].] You must not be angry that I give you this trouble. Nobody can, nobody will, help me efficaciously in my distress but yourself. Be so good as to call here in your way home to dinner†.

Solicitor-General to the Earl of Hardwicke [*endorsed by the latter*]. *From Charles.* Habeas Corpus

[H. 5, f. 241.] Saturday, *March 11th*, 1758.

MY LORD,

I saw Mr Pitt last night, to whom I found Mr Grenville had fully related what I mentioned to your Lordship. He said that having given the opinion which I did in private, at a meeting of those of my own profession, it was impossible for me to avoid giving an opinion in public and in the manner I did[2]; that he was sorry to differ, and was much obliged to me for giving myself the trouble to explain what did not require any explanation, with more to the same purpose. Amongst other things he dropt, that the Speaker[3]

* Sir Joseph's abilities are very considerable, but the true reason was that the King thought he would do his business German. H.

[1] He had lost Pitt's favour through his secret negotiations with the Duke of N. in 1757, which had been related to Pitt. He however retained his office now till 1761, when he was dismissed.

† I have often wondered that my Lord led such a life, the constant go-between in the D. of Newcastle's commissions. H.

[2] p. 3. [3] Arthur Onslow.

had led the Attorney-General [Pratt] into it. He desired to know whether I imagined that many others would take part. I said that I spoke for myself and knew of nobody, who would engage on the same side, but Mr Wilbraham. He rested his argument, as I imagined he would, on the strict letter of the Resolutions 3d Caroli[1], which he considered as a landmark of the Constitution; and he would say in the language of the *Mirror*, that the exercising any discretion before the body was brought up, was an *abusion* of the Common Law, and that judges who relaxed such points were not judges according to his idea. I do not trouble your Lordship with what I said, but could not help giving you these *traits* of the conversation. He then talked much about the affairs of Europe, the King and the King of Prussia, and Gen. Yorke; and I left him at 10 o'clock.

Lord Royston to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 4, f. 1.] ST JAMES' SQUARE, *March* 18, 1758.

MY LORD,

Count Viri[2], whom I had not seen for some time, made me a visit this morning. He began with the *Habeas Corpus* Bill which, your Lordship may suppose, he considers rather in a political than legal light; and expressed his wishes that some amendments might be made, either before it went up to the House of Lords or after it got there, which should remove the principal objections to it. I endeavoured to convince him that this was in a manner impossible upon the present frame of the Bill, that the friends of it did not seem disposed to admit of any material alterations or to contract the plan which they went upon. He intimated to me that Mr Pitt's taking up this affair, and carrying it on without concert, etc. was not approved of in a certain place[3]; but he seemed to wish, and I am apt to conclude that his wishes on these subjects are those of others, that some method could be struck out, which should save the Bill, and yet take out the sting of it. I told him, I thought the Bill must be left to its fate in the House of Lords, where the subject would be discussed with more gravity and temper than in the House of Commons. I gave him some account of Mr Pitt's speech, particularly of those parts of it which were fitter for a demagogue in opposition, than the King's first Minister in the House of Commons....

I cannot conclude without allowing myself the pleasure of repeating to your Lordship, that I think my Brother's speech yesterday in the House, was as able a performance as I ever heard there. He urged everything that could be suggested in support

[1] Of March 1628. These were the Resolutions which preceded the Petition of Right. See H. 530, f. 44.

[2] The Sardinian minister.

[3] Leicester House and Lord Bute.

of his side of the argument, and with the greatest judgment, firmness, decency and manly eloquence. It is but justice to him to say this, and I pronounce upon his speech as an impartial bystander....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 193, f. 388.] CLAREMONT, *March 27th*, 1758.

...If your Lordship ever dips into newspapers, you will see them filled with most dangerous impertinence upon all subjects, and particularly this of the *Habeas Corpus*. A meeting is summoned of the citizens upon this occasion, or at least flung out, and *The Three Monosyllables* (a cant word given out), Pitt, Legge and Pratt, are to be the objects of their praise and adulation. If this method of proceeding is not stopped, we shall have the mob at the door of the House of Lords, *demanding justice*, if they presume to differ from the House of Commons. Mr Pitt should certainly be spoke to by some person of great weight and consideration, and showed the consequences to government which must arise from letting the mob loose in this manner, and if he persists, he must have the whole left in his hands; for nobody (who has been bred up in a contrary way of acting) can have a share in such an administration....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 198; N. 194, f. 157.]

NEWCASTLE HOUSE, Friday at night, *April 14th*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD,

My company staid with me late but Mr Pitt who came unexpectedly, staid an hour alone with me after them. The first part of his conversation was very reasonable and well. The latter (the material one) very far otherwise. It was upon the *Habeas Corpus*, wherein he employed all his eloquence to persuade me of the reasonableness of this bill, and how much the nation insisted upon it. "It was the case of the *Habeas Corpus*."—When I objected what occurred to me, and argued a little from what I had heard from those who understood it, he took me up high and would have me say "that the lawyers were the judges," which he scouted much, and then endeavoured to frighten or bully me into an acquiescence; "that the nation would insist upon it; that it was not a squib but a reality; that my Lord Mansfield had taken upon him to alter the law, that the point was, Lord Mansfield had ordered a rule of Court instead of granting the *Habeas Corpus*, as he was obliged by law to do[1]; that judges might be impeached for this

[1] p. 2.

breach of the law; that it was the case of the ship-money; he would say that in this case 'there was no ill intention,' but it was a breach of the law; that he could take upon him to show that the judges had frequently given up the law and liberty; that it was time to prevent it." I saw I was to be bullied, and I determined to stick to my point. He told me "that those who supported my Lord Mansfield must take my Lord Mansfield's fate." I talked as strongly on my side; that I should act according to my conscience, in this point not out of regard to my Lord Mansfield, but, because I thought it right. He said strongly, he thought he had *now* connected himself with those who thought alike upon great points, and were friends to liberty (for through the whole he asserted, as it were, every opposer of this Bill to be an enemy to liberty and the *Habeas Corpus*). I asserted the contrary, and said I should act according to my conscience. I was very indifferent what people might think of it; but I fancied I should not be thought an enemy to liberty. He talked of the prerogative of the Crown, as if it had been insinuated by my Lord Mansfield and his friends to the King that that was affected by it. I told him I heard Lord Mansfield say that that was no ways concerned in the question. I mentioned, with the respect that is due to it, your Lordship's opinion, and particularly as to this point having been brought in without concert. He said slightly that your Lordship had said something of that kind to him, that he did not care to dispute with you; that he thought in a case of *liberty* that was not to be expected; that he had read (as he supposed I had) Lyttelton, Coke, Selden and Sir Simond D'Ewes, and was as able to talk upon this question "as any lawyer."—In short a greater rhapsody of violence and virulence could not be flung out; and if it was not meant to bully me (in which he entirely failed of his aim), I should think he will carry this point to the utmost extremity. I go to-morrow morning to Claremont. If you go out in the morning, I wish you would call here....

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Lord Mansfield to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 247, f. 173.] Tuesday at night, *April 18th*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD,

I owe it to your Lordship to acquaint you instantly that, upon my coming home, I received a letter that an extraordinary meeting had been called at the Half Moon by surprize, to have a Common Council for Benson's petition, etc.: and [the] whole *Habeas Corpus* Bill in the House of Commons. 80 were present and none of the warmest absent. My friends beat them

without their daring so much as to put a question, so that this villainy is at an end. Long, the promoter, desired to leave the Chair and the matter never to be resumed[1].

I ever am,

Your Lordship's most obliged etc.

MANSFIELD.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 203; N. 195, f. 96.] CLAREMONT, *May 16th*, 1758.

[Mr Pitt was much incensed by the opposition to the "Bill for the confirmation of the Liberties of the People by the *Habeas Corpus*," demanded explanations of the Duke and seemed to wish the Bill should be dropped, which he would by no means agree to; on the contrary, he (the Duke) could not consent to any management, and was taking measures to have the majority in the Lords against it as large as possible. The King was also adverse to the measure.] The King immediately proposed to remove my Lord President[2] and Mr Pratt and to make my Lord Hardwicke President and his son Attorney-General. I only answered by putting it off and saying, "Your Majesty will think of that." He expressed the greatest dissatisfaction with Mr Pitt and I could find, though there was nothing dropped directly, that the King entertained a hope that somehow or other, he should get rid of him. He was particularly gracious to me, my power, my credit, etc. *always* (as I hope he always will) joining your Lordship with me with the highest expressions of confidence and regard. He talked also upon Mr Fox's subject, said a great deal against him, that he knew he never could be *minister*, but however, he was a brave fellow, would pull by the nose, etc. and he would have me *manage* him. [Afterwards the King had told Lady Yarmouth that they were ready to turn out Pitt and act with Fox, and put his plan into execution, and he (the Duke) must remove this misunderstanding in his next audience. It would be impossible to go on without Pitt.] Could Mr Pitt get me into a trap, to remain, with the show of one of the ministers, and to have no one man in Council upon whose head and act I could depend—or to be more particular, without my Lord Hardwicke *hand and heart*, he would have a triumph over me, which I hope never to give him or anybody else.

[1] "His [Pitt's] chief battery was levelled against my Lord Mansfield....And an attempt was made in the City by some of Mr Pitt's faction to raise a popular storm on him there, with so little foundation, that the agents in it were forced [to] let drop the charge with disgrace and confusion." Lord Lyttelton to Governor Lyttelton, May 5th, 1758. (*Mem.* by R. Phillimore, 608.)

[2] Lord Granville, who supported the bill.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 195, f. 114.] WIMPOLE, Wednesday, *May 17th*, 1758.

[He believes that part, at least, of Pitt's peevishness and low spirits is owing to his distemper.] Under these circumstances your Grace certainly did right to leave him to cool, and not at that time to put yourself in the way of coming to explanations with him. My own opinion is that he will not quit on account of that bill. What other circumstances, particularly his own unmanageable ill-health, may incline him to, I don't pretend to guess. I do not believe there ever was, from the beginning of time, an instance of a point of this nature so taken up and so pushed; a mere question of law, two lawyers in the King's Cabinet Council, and not one word of consultation or communication with either of them, but entirely cooked up between himself and his new Attorney-General, who must be entirely inexperienced in constitutional or parliamentary measures. Not the least complaint or call from the people, and yet now "the national weight" (in respect of public affairs) is put upon it, and it is called "the rejecting the confirmation of their liberties in the *Habeas Corpus* Bill," as if it was the most solemn Petition of Right for the redress of real grievances. Your Grace asks what is to be done? To which I can answer no otherwise than I have done formerly. Submit to pass the bill you cannot with decency or with common sense. If it were possible to amend it in the Committee, I should be for that; but they have taken care to frame the bill so as to make that impracticable, in my apprehension. I can therefore see no medium, unless there was temper enough on the other side to submit (after this bill is laid aside) to let the judges be ordered to prepare and bring in a reasonable bill to remedy the few defects that have been admitted to exist, and to make some more practicable provision for the discharge of men impressed for the land-service under any recruiting acts that may be in force for the time being, when the commissioners have proceeded oppressively or unduly. I have turned it over and over in my head, and can think of nothing else. But if nothing will satisfy but for the Lords to swallow this absurd bill, 'tis impossible. As to any wavering amongst the judges, I know nothing of it, nor can your Grace do anything in it. My Lord Mansfield, being one of their body, has more opportunities of knowing and more facilities of giving them right hints, I mean in matters of law, than anybody else.

I am thoroughly of opinion that it would be extremely wrong for the King or any of his servants to carry or speak of the consequences of anybody's either espousing or opposing this bill further than of the propriety or impropriety of the thing itself. The way to make it of still more unhappy consequence and to add clamour to clamour, and to make it really looked upon as what it is not, a point of prerogative against liberty, is to talk of turning out people for their behaviour upon this point. I would not, on any account, have it imagined that the King harboured a thought of turning out Mr Pratt or promoting my son at present. Much less would I have it buzzed or suspected that he harboured a thought of removing my Lord President on this occasion. For the sake of His Majesty's service I would by no means come in in that manner. I am convinced that it would make a great business of a little one, and do infinite prejudice to the King's service and affairs. There should be no talk, or insinuation, about any such consequences, though it will certainly be right for His Majesty to remain, and to appear, firm in his opinion against the bill.

It will be very material to gain the Duke of Bedford, or at least that he should not appear for the bill. I have not heard whether his Grace is landed or not[1].

That other considerations enter into this matter now, I see clearly from your Grace's narrative, and am extremely sorry for it. That disposition[2] should be kept down to the utmost; for the King's affairs, either of war or peace, should not be spoiled for it. Besides, if anything of that kind transpires, it may revolt, or at least abate, the zeal of many of your friends, who will be extremely averse to the restoring of Mr Fox to the administration. I have heard the term "brave fellow" often before, but have seen no substantial proofs of it, of late especially. I hope therefore that your Grace either has already, or will, pursue your plan of absolutely undeceiving the King of any misconstruction he may have made on this subject, and rooting out any hopes of your acting with a patched up administration on that foot. You will otherwise, at the end of the session, be in the utmost confusion....

[1] The Duke of Bedford was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.
[2] Of the King against Pitt and for Fox.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 195, f. 170; H. 69, f. 212.] CLAREMONT, *May* 21*st*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD,...

Mr Pitt has had a long conference on Thursday last with my Lady Yarmouth, where he has made use of all arguments of threat and cajolerie to show the necessity of passing the bill. He told her the nation would be in a flame; petitions and addresses from all quarters; that nothing could go on, etc., if the bill was rejected; that my Lord President had "eternized" his name with the nation, the city and "the constitution," by the part he had taken in it; that he "pitied" the Duke of Newcastle; that it was my Lord Hardwicke's "vanity," and that, as to my Lord Mansfield, he would be "attacked." She reasoned as well as she could, and insisted upon the "opinion of the judges." He said, "Madam, if all the Bishops on the Bench should be of opinion that the People should not have the use of the Bible, would the People part with their Bible?"—She thought the conversation most extravagant, and by way of threat there was nothing omitted that could carry terror with it.

As to cajoleries, that went still further. [Mr Pitt now declared strongly against doing anything for the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel[1].] He said, "The Duke of Newcastle might do it if he pleased; that he should not oppose it, but that he declared *now*, and should declare *hereafter*, that he disapproved it."...After a great deal of discourse of this kind, he said, however, if the bill could be suffered to pass, he would then not only give the Landgrave £20,000 but even £30,000. This may create in your Lordship astonishment, but it cannot want a comment that a measure, which had been in the same conversation represented as unnecessary, prejudicial, etc., should now be exceeded, in order to show the world that no one House of Parliament dares oppose a measure he is for. The public is much obliged to him for taking such care of their revenues and their interests. This has made so great an impression on the person to whom it was said, to the disadvantage of the author, that she determines not to tell it to the King. And it must be an absolute secret, though I find both M. Knyphausen and my Lord Holderness understand that to be his way of thinking and acting....

I have one point which gives me great concern, but that I am desired not to mention to your Lordship as you know the whole from the Solicitor-General, and indeed, I know very incorrectly any part of it. I mean some reason to suspect *intrigue* amongst the judges, which has already engaged all the judges of the Common Pleas and Mr Baron Legge to determine not to answer your

[1] See vol. i. 656 *n*.

Lordship's last question relating to the consequences of the bill[1]. You must know the fact so much better than I and can judge what is right to do upon it, that I can only lament this unhappy turn. For it will certainly have very bad effects. Your Lordship and my Lord Mansfield must direct us and conduct us.

I forgot to tell you one circumstance which has comfort in it. Lord Holderness tells me, he has talked with my Lord Bute upon the present situation; that my Lord Bute is very cool and reasonable; blames "the flight" of Mr Pitt which will blow over, and Lord Holderness is persuaded (and I am apt to believe it) that Leicester House has not yet taken any part in this affair[2]....

I have this moment received an important letter[3] from my Lady Yarmouth, of which I send your Lordship a copy, in the greatest confidence. Mr Pitt is playing the part fully everywhere, and will try what temptation will do. I don't in the least fear him, or the steadiness both above and below stairs at Kensington. But it is not a pleasant thing to have the King told that every measure, that His Majesty can wish (and it will certainly go to further offers for the support of Prince Ferdinand's army and perhaps future *dédommagement*), shall be granted, if a bill, disliked and opposed by particular persons in the King's service, could be *let* pass....

[He desires Lord Hardwicke's mature consideration and advice.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 195, f. 192.] WIMPOLE, *May 22nd*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD...,

Your Grace will, at this time, be so good as to spare me the trouble of writing, and yourself of reading, any observations upon the conversation with Lady Yarmouth, *the menaces* and *the cajoleries*, or the panegyric upon my Lord President. For my part, I am not anxious to *eternize* my name by such a speech, tho' I think the end of the speech is attained, if it has procured protection from that quarter. From the *pity* bestowed upon your Grace in so friendly a manner, I see upon whose head the blame is

[1] The 3rd, see p. 13. Hon. Heneage Legge, second son of the first earl of Dartmouth and brother of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (1704–1759), baron of the Exchequer.

[2] Cf. however Bute to Pitt, June 4, 1758, after effusive and flattering expressions of his regard and friendship: "What a terrible proof was Friday in the House of Lords [when the bill was rejected without a division] of the total loss of public spirit, and the most supreme indifference to those valuable rights, for the obtaining which our ancestors freely risked both life and fortune!" *Chatham Corr.* i. 316.

[3] H. 69, f. 220, in which she said: "Je pense, my Lord Duc, que vous pouvez bien ...faire le sacrifice et laisser passer son Bill, et alors l'affaire de Hesse et même celle de Danemark pourrait se faire sans la moindre difficulté."

to be rested. But I think I am pretty well off, when my conduct in this affair is imputed only to *vanity*, a tolerably innocent motive for these times. That *vanity* has been a great ingredient in pushing this bill, I take to be extremely true. But the charge is misplaced, though every body carries a racket about them to strike the ball from themselves. As to the Landgrave of Hesse..., I wish a right way could be found out to encourage and fix him; but I am sure it would not be worth the *People's* while to give His Serene Highness either 20 or 30 pence for the sake of this bill....The lady shows her good judgment by the light wherein she sees the cajoleries, and the King did excessively right in making no answer or observations upon what was said to him....It is now in the hands of the judges, the proper persons to consider the grounds of it, and I should think you two [the Duke and Pitt] might talk *dispassionately* upon it. Surely it is he, who has hitherto declined communication upon it. I don't mean by this to add to your plagues, for you have abundantly more than enough. The King's goodness and confidence and just consideration of your services are a great support, and I heartily rejoice in it and as heartily wish the continuance of it.

Charles gave me an account of what he had heard of the difficulty made by some of the judges as to answering the third question. This is one effect of the delay which was gained; for I always thought it would produce cabal and intrigue. I think I guess at the person[1] amongst them from whom it comes; and if that guess is right, it is the worst symptom as to Leicester House. I always feared my Lord Mansfield was too sure of that gentleman. It is a strange, ill-founded objection to come from the judges. If there was anything in it (which there certainly is not), it should come from the House. As to what should be done upon it, if the objection should be made, I think as at present advised—

1st. That considering the disposition from which this proceeds, it may be dangerous to compel them to give an opinion as to the consequences of the bill, lest that should provoke them to give it all the favourable turns they can. But, however, the right of the House to demand their opinions on such a question must, in my apprehension, be asserted.

2nd. May not the judges be, by indulgence, left to their own

[1] Sir John Willes, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, who had desired further time for preparing the answers. *Parl. Hist.* xv. 903. He had long been an adherent of Leicester House. See above, vol. i. 478 *n.*

judgment, such of them as shall think fit to answer the question, to give their opinions upon it, and such of them as choose to decline it, to be suffered to do so?

3d. Or in case five or six of them should join in insisting upon this objection, may it [not] be right to waive this third question[1], in the generality of it, as to all the judges, reserving liberty to any Lord to ask their opinions in the course of the debate, as to any particular questions that may arise upon any particular provisions or words in the bill?

No other method occurs to me, and I see that either the first or the third method may probably spin the thing out into more length.

As to the regularity of the question, I have no doubt, and precedents may be shown of it. But I find 'tis the latter words of it of which they pretend to lay hold.

I formerly told your Grace that Lord Bute was very cool and reasonable in his conversation with me on this subject, but he went further with Lord Holderness in naming Mr P[itt][2]....

I am, my dearest Lord,

Ever most affectionately and faithfully yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 222.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *June 1st*, 1758.

...I have had a very long conversation with Mr Pitt this morning at Kensington. The style was quite changed, plaintiff but civil, some very unreasonable expressions, but at last rather good humour and joking than otherwise. The purport was that he would serve as long as he could do good; that he was in hopes we would not have given him this "box on the ear" etc. But the principal point was the vote of credit. He seemed uneasy that I had settled everything with the Chancellor of the Exchequer; that it was an affair of the Treasury and that he would acquiesce; that he would advise me (whom he affected in good humour to call my Lord Treasurer) to ask but 5 or 600,000£....He spoke often jokingly, though feelingly, of my Lord President's "being sent to grass[3]."...The King wants a large sum to enable us to do what he may wish, Mr Pitt a smaller sum for fear of it....and upon the whole I wish to have your thoughts before 12 to-morrow. I am, my dearest Lord,

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[1] This course was adopted, see p. 17.

[2] But see above, p. 50 *n.*

[3] Lord Granville.

[On June 2, 1758 (N. 195, f. 303), Lord Hardwicke observes to the Duke of Newcastle that Mr Pitt, "the Great Man," by all appearances, "was putting water into his wine," and hopes the Duke will manage to take Pitt along with him in the vote of credit for the army, and that it may pass unanimously.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 224.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *June 3rd*, 1758.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I cannot forbear again congratulating your Lordship upon the great success of the work you begun, and have now yourself finished so much to your honour and the public service. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was here this morning. He is as happy upon the event as I am, and that is saying a great deal. He says the manner you have ended this affair, by the reference to the judges, and the event of yesterday, prevents any triumph *some people* might have had, and takes away from them the means of blowing up, addressing, etc. He has convinced me that we cannot do with less than £800,000 vote of credit....After what passed yesterday, I am determined to be for the militia bill on Tuesday; and indeed, if some bill don't pass, the whole country will be in confusion about the present bill....You will forgive me, but I cannot avoid throwing out to you that after all that has passed and with so much success, I really think you should be in the House on Tuesday. There is not the least occasion for you to take an active part; your appearance is sufficient[1]. I once more wish you joy, and with ten thousand thanks for your great and noble behaviour,

I am, my dearest Lord,

Ever most affectionately and unalterably yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 195, f. 353.] POWIS HOUSE, *Wedn: June 7th*, 1758.

[Encloses draft of the Speech for the close of the Session.]

I am told that after I left the House yesterday, they ordered the Standing Orders to be taken into consideration this day. So short time was never given for a consideration of so much consequence to the House. I hope your Grace will not be for altering the order about keeping strangers out of the House. It is

[1] Lord Hardwicke attended; see next letter.

the very same attempt which was made by the Opposition in the year 1742, upon which there was a division, and your Grace and I voted against making the alteration. It proceeds from the same spirit of faction and low popularity....

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

[*Memorandum by the Duke of Newcastle of an interview with Count Viri* (*the Sardinian minister*), *February 21st*, 1759. (N. 203, f. 204.)]

...Lord Bute said, Mr Pitt was not contented to be Secretary of State but he must direct the Treasury too, which he ought not to do; that the Prince of Wales and Lord Bute esteemed Mr Pitt, but that his temper and his overbearing were what they could not but much blame.

That the Grenvilles were now more violent and outrageous than ever against my Lord Hardwicke, which I understood my friend had from my Lord Bute, and that their violence recommended my Lord Hardwicke still more to my Lord Bute, as he thought their view was to set him against Lord Hardwicke, whose credit and consequence were so great.

[On February 27, 1759 [N. 203, f. 273; H. 70, ff. 83–9], Lord Hardwicke writes to the Duke of Newcastle on the serious condition of the finances and the diminution of the stock of coin in the Bank. (A deputation from the Bank had attended the Duke of Newcastle on February 22, and declared to him that they knew not how soon they might be obliged to stop payment, and that they were approaching a national bankruptcy.) Mr Pitt has at last confessed the necessity of attending to the situation.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 205, f. 253.] MOOR PARK, Sunday, *April 22nd*, 1759.

[He cannot approve of dropping the augmentation of the judges' salaries now, which would look like unsteadiness in the administration, be yielding to wild and malevolent men, and leave the advance made last year to the judges as a fee for the opinion given by them about the *Habeas Corpus*. He urges the Duke to strengthen the Treasury in the House of Commons, where he should have somebody to defend it.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 205, f. 387.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *April 29th*, 1759. Sunday night.

...The account of the meeting[1] at Mr Speaker's is very curious. I have since had some account both from my Lord Advocate and the Solicitor, who agree in substance with the paper you sent me. 'Twas quite *novum et ante hunc diem inauditum* for an Attorney-General to refuse the Chancellor of the Exchequer to come to a meeting about business of the House of Commons. This to me is a stronger symptom of Mr Pitt's disposition than anything else. I am told also that, tho' Mr Legge's friend, Dr Haye, was there, he never so much as opened his lips. The part taken by the Master of the House[2] deserves a name which I will not give it. 'Tis plainly getting off from what he had said, tho' he professes in words to adhere. As to presents to the judges, I never heard the least complaint of any such thing in all my time; nor have I ever heard of anything of that kind, except a buck or a sheep in the circuits, which the county gentlemen may deliver themselves from, without the aid of a clause in an Act of Parliament. Your Grace asks me what will become of this bill? I am sure I am not able to tell you. But I know what I would do if I was Mr Legge. To be drawn into such a measure by the Speaker with the unanimous concurrence or acquiescence of the House, and to have it afterwards factiously overruled or borne down in this manner,—I would never show my face in the House of Commons as Chancellor of the Exchequer afterwards....I will wait on your Grace to-morrow night between eight and nine o'clock; and you will at the same time forgive me for putting you in mind, that I have been at your Grace's service every Monday evening, since I came to Knightsbridge....

[On June 3, 1759 (N. 206, f. 399; H. 70, f. 163), the Duke of Newcastle complains to Lord Hardwicke of the conduct of Lord Holderness, which had been "both rude and impertinent." He] sneered at me when I turned my back. I shall not endure this behaviour from his Lordship and shall, for the future, have as little communication with him as possible.

[1] On April 27 (see f. 368), the object of the meeting being the apportionment of taxes for the augmentation of the judges' salaries, when the Speaker gave his opinion that there would be great opposition, enquiries and altercations, and "that there must be a clause to prevent all presents to the judges, for the future." Legge thought that, considering all the difficulties, it would be better to drop the bill. Sir Charles Pratt had refused even to come to the meeting.

[2] The Speaker.

[In reply (N. 206, f. 404) Lord Hardwicke censures Lord Holderness's behaviour as] very silly and surprising. The difficulty lies not in parting with him, but in supplying his place in these times.

Memorandum [of the Duke of Newcastle] relating to my Lord Holderness

[N. 206, f. 443.] CLAREMONT, *June 6th*, 1759.

To complain seriously to the King of my Lord Holderness's behaviour. To assure the King that I do not think it for His Majesty's service that in the present circumstances he should be removed; but I earnestly wish that some person might be employed by His Majesty to talk seriously to my Lord Holderness, and to represent to him how necessary it is (in His Majesty's opinion) that my Lord Holderness should alter his behaviour and manner towards the Duke of Newcastle, who had given him so many proofs of his friendship and regard....

My Lord Hardwicke is the only person who can do this with judgment, dignity and effect.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 207, f. 34.] *June 13th*, 1759.

...I propose, God willing, to be in Grosvenor Square on Monday evening. I am very sorry that Mr Pitt should suppose that any meeting on public business could be put off on account of my being in the country. It is impossible for me to go on upon that foot, for it is loading me with all the delays that happen, just as was done, even in letters to Holland, at the latter end of the last long vacation. I have no power, am in no office, nor desire any; and if this is to be the case, it will lay me under a necessity to decline coming to any meetings, tho' when I am in town, I never spare time or pains.

I am very sorry that any uneasiness is created to your Grace, especially from those who have the greatest obligations to you. As to familiar whispers, etc. I fancy, if you showed less sensibility of them, they would seldomer happen....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 210, f. 78; H. 70, f. 241.] CLAREMONT, *August 31st*, 1759.

[Various difficulties were confronting him. The Militia Act, as it is the law, he will carry out as far as is necessary, but he will make no flaming speeches in its support. Pitt was showing great ill-humour at the delay in giving Lord Temple the Garter and had

said, "[I shall] from what shall be done in it, see what I am to think with regard to *myself*: I don't mean (muttering something like) quitting; I have had sufficient reason for that long ago."—The only way was for the King to promise the next vacant Garter to Lord Temple; the effect would be inconceivable. Legge, moreover, insisted upon being made a peer.]

...I will tell your Lordship a fact, which I learnt this morning from my Lord Lincoln..., that Lord Temple's resentment to me is beyond expression, that he will show it in every instance by falling upon me and the Treasury, at the same time that he will endeavour to distinguish Mr Pitt and *his measures**, and even that it is probable that my Lord Temple may quit his employment and Mr Pitt by consent remain in; so that I and my friends are to support in everything Mr Pitt and his measures, and Mr Pitt's nearest relations and friends are to be tearing me to pieces. I hope my friends will not suffer this. I intend to lay the whole on Monday next before the King and my Lady Yarmouth....

...I hear further that there is an implacable hatred to my Lord Mansfield who, they hint, is the Duke of Cumberland's Chancellor, and not a great deal less to another great friend of mine[1], tho' perhaps they are not so open in declaring it, as they may think him more out of their reach, and happy it is for him that he is....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 210, f. 485; H. 70, f. 254.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Sept. 19th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD...

...I have acquainted your Lordship with the first appearances of Mr Pitt's discontent....I renewed my application on Friday last. The King was extremely civil and gracious to me, often telling me the confidence he had in me; that he was not angry with me; that Mr Pitt knew how offended he was with my Lord Temple and the reason he had for it; that the order of the Garter would be disgraced; that he would not do it, etc. When I went out of the Closet, the two Secretaries went in, and some time after both came down to my Lady Yarmouth, where I was. Mr Pitt very decent but very grave; Holderness lifting up his eyes with astonishment but saying nothing, except that he never saw anything so bad in his life. Mr Pitt then very decently said that he found His Majesty extremely displeased with him; that the King would hardly answer him any question he asked, would give him no orders....All the King would say was,—"Do as you please"—often repeated. Mr Pitt behaved, as I find, very decently and respectfully in the Closet. I took him out in a private room and, to do him justice, he was very cool and very decent, but complained most heavily of the King's behaviour to him, which put it out of

* My Lord Temple's getting the Garter in this manner was abominable. H.

[1] Lord Hardwicke himself.

his power to be of any use; that he had done his best; that he did not pretend to have more merit than others, but the measures taken by His Majesty's servants (or something implying joint measures) had succeeded; that he found himself so disagreeable to the King that he did not know what to do. I then told him in general what I had done; that the King had told Lady Yarmouth that the Duke of Newcastle was a *coward* and the Duke of Devonshire a *fool*....

When I went to my Lady Yarmouth [on the Monday following], I found her in the utmost distress and concern. Mr Pitt was not at Court on Monday and Lady Yarmouth did then, and does still, conclude that he will quit....She concluded the Garter would not now do; that the King could not ask Mr Pitt's pardon; that *she* could say nothing to Mr Pitt to bring him back. She blamed the King to the greatest degree; she took Pitt's part in everything, the success of the measures everywhere, the great assistance given to the King in his electoral affairs, the unanimity and support of the nation in everything; in short, Lady Yarmouth was as strong upon this head as Mr Pitt could be himself; that upon the unhappy turn which the King of Prussia's affairs had taken, Mr Pitt had showed the greatest concern, and had told her that "we were now all at sea again"; that he had flattered himself that he should have been able to have "given, or laid before, the King, America, the West Indies, Africa," and such a situation of affairs in Germany, as might enable His Majesty to make "what peace he pleased." but that the distress of the King of Prussia had embarrassed everything. [Lady Yarmouth believed that Pitt wished to quit for another reason besides, namely, his fear that he could not arrange a peace to the King's satisfaction; that he had announced his intention of doing business in the future with the King by means of a third person, and that she feared the King had serious designs of getting rid of him. He (the Duke) could not go on in such a manner, with Pitt out, or Pitt still in the ministry, but opposing, with his friend, all government measures, except those in which he was directly interested. In a subsequent interview with the King, the Duke had pressed upon him the necessity of union in the administration.] I then said that I found him [Pitt] the other day extremely mortified, tho' very decent....The King then began to justify himself, that he was out of humour the other day, that he had been "plagued"; why might not he be out of humour when he was so? that showing Mr Pitt that he would not be governed by him was the best way to deal with him, etc. I wished His Majesty might find it so; that I was glad to see Mr Pitt at Court, that I did not know what part he might have taken or might still take....

[On September 20, 1759 (N. 211, f. 1), Lord Hardwicke answers the Duke of Newcastle's long letter of September 19. He hopes the King will yield on the point of Lord Temple's Garter; for

though he had reason to be offended with Lord Temple, that, however, must be considered as forgiven by his appointing him Lord Privy Seal. He felt sure that Pitt had no real intention of resigning for this or any other cause. The strong language was used with the aim of securing the Garter, and he and his party intended to remain in power till the new reign. The Duke had acted very wisely in telling Lady Yarmouth plainly that it would be impossible to go on without Pitt], and as to the King's saying, "The Duke of Newcastle is a coward, and he might carry it on if he would," that is but the old story of 1757. And yet His Majesty was then forced to do what he then did; and however bitter the pill was, it has been much to the advantage of his affairs, and this he ought to recollect....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 211, f. 40; H. 70, f. 263.] CLAREMONT, *Sept. 22nd*, 1759.

...Mr Pitt came yesterday after Court into my room and stayed near an hour, and talked almost the whole time. He was very cool, very decent, seemingly very good-humoured but extremely determined. He told me he expected, or insisted upon an answer one way or other upon my Lord Temple's Garter in seven or eight days, that he might know his fate and determine his conduct; that he had taken his resolution that, if he was now ultimately refused, he would come seldom to Court, only when his own business required it, and that he would make no secret of his usage and the cause of his dissatisfaction; [that the Garter for Lord Temple was a reasonable return for his own services, and he asked nothing for himself and nothing more for others.]...He desired nothing but this one outward mark of the King's approbation, and it was hard if he could not have it. In short, this done, Mr Pitt (for the present at least) will do everything. This not done, he will do nothing and fling everything into confusion....Mr Pitt said emphatically that the King was within a finger's breadth (though His Majesty did not know it) of being easy and happy all his reign, or of not passing one single moment in ease and quiet.... Upon the whole, I think it is my duty to lay before the King on Monday next what passed with Mr Pitt. My own opinion, the Duke of Devonshire's and your Lordship's the King knows, and there I must leave it. Mr Pitt, at the conclusion of the conversation and, indeed, throughout the whole, showed great satisfaction with me in this affair, and said emphatically that since the affair of the Garter had been resumed in earnest, I had done all that man could do. [Upon every consideration, if the King refuses, it will be impossible for the government to go on.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 211, f. 50.] WIMPOLE, *Sept. 23rd*, 1759.

...I am convinced that without keeping this administration entire, the King can neither carry on the war nor make peace. And, if peace is to be made, the united strength of the administration will be equally wanted in order to carry the voice and strength of the people along with his Majesty's measures, which, without keeping Mr Pitt, and that also in some degree of good humour, cannot, as things are now unhappily situated, be had. One thing was said by Mr Pitt to your Grace, "that he desired this as a mark of the King's approbation of, and as a return for, his services." Why may not the King put it upon that, without any regard to my Lord Temple with whom he is so much offended?...

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 211, f. 134; H. 70, f. 272.] CLAREMONT, *Sep. 27th*, 1759.

MY DEAREST LORD,

...On my arrival at Kensington on Monday...I found His Majesty in perfect good humour, talking over all affairs, declaring his dependence upon me, speaking of the highest regard of your Lordship (although I had before read even a paragraph out of your letter relating to Mr Pitt, which then seemed to make some impression, at least occasioned *no hard words*): that my Lord Hardwicke was his man, or to that effect; that "you must take care of me," meaning his Electoral affairs....I returned to the Lady [who had been afraid to say anything to the King on the subject of Lord Temple's Garter, but who now consented to prepare the way, before the Duke spoke to him on Wednesday]....I found soon at the Levee that His Majesty was fully apprized of my errand. I began by acquainting him that we had the day before done everything at the Treasury that his Hanover Chancery desired....That availed nothing....The King then went on in a style we are but too well acquainted with. He had nothing to say to the Protocol[1]. We did as we pleased: he was *nothing* here; that he wished he had stayed at Hanover in 1755.—I took the liberty to ask His Majesty if he thought he should have been so quiet at Hanover, when there was, or would have been, a war in Germany.—"But, you don't know, which side I would have taken."—"Either side, Sir, taken, your Majesty must have been subject to the fortune of war."—"But, I wish I could

[1] With the King of Prussia, in which it was declared that a negotiation for peace should be begun, when the issue of the campaign in America became known.

take a bark now and go to Hanover."—"Does your Majesty think at present you would be more easy there than here?"—To which I had no reply. On these most unfavourable appearances (which would have been the same any other day) I proceeded to open my budget, and though very negative, yet after the first flights were over, the King was civil and gracious to me and rather cajoling. I saw the view of that and did not take it for a good sign; but, however, it gave me an opportunity of giving my opinion, the Duke of Devonshire's and your Lordship's, most fully and clearly upon the subject. I began by telling His Majesty that it was my duty to acquaint him with a conversation Mr Pitt had had with me, on Friday last....I made a most faithful report, but in as advantageous a manner as I could for Mr Pitt. Before I could enter into my report His Majesty began very crossly—"I know you have been tormenting my Lady Yarmouth about it. Why do you plague her? What has she to do with these things? The only comfortable two hours I have in the whole day are those I pass there, and you are always teasing her with these things."—"Because, Sir, I thought it the most respectful way of conveying them to your Majesty."—I then (as I said) made my relation. And this was my answer—that His Majesty would not give my Lord Temple the Garter, that my Lord Temple had insulted him: that it was a shame to be so treated: that if a method could be found that the thing might be done without any act to be performed by the King, he would consent to it etc.—I represented everything that occurred to me to induce the King to consent. I assured him that Mr Pitt had expressed himself with the utmost decency and respect; that he had renounced the notion of force from the beginning; that he wished it only as a demonstration of His Majesty's approbation of his services, by this mark in the person of his brother-in-law, whose station, fortune and family rendered him an object. To that the King made no reply, but that Lords Privy Seal had not had it. I represented the consequences of the refusal in the strongest light and the opinions of those of his servants in whom he had confidence, viz. the Duke of Devonshire, my Lord Hardwicke and myself. He said that the Duke of Devonshire was a very good man, but that he was a coward as well as myself: and that my Lord Hardwicke had more courage, and that I would have given up the *Habeas Corpus* affair, if it had not been for my Lord Hardwicke and my Lord Mansfield. I assured His Majesty that that was entirely a misinformation: for that no consideration should ever have made me give up that point, which I thought so right and so material. I urged all the arguments I could make use of. I should have said that, in the beginning, His Majesty very angrily said,—"Did not you tell me you would not leave me?"—"Yes, Sir, and I don't think of leaving you."—"What did you mean then by what you said to my Lady Yarmouth?"—"Nothing of leaving you; I only said I did not see any possibility of carrying on your affairs."—And afterwards

I asked the King what were His Majesty's own thoughts upon that. He said—"There is Legge and Barrington."—"Indeed, Sir, that will not do. I have spoke to Mr Legge, and find he will not dare undertake anything."—"Well, if Mr Pitt comes to Court seldom, so much the better; I don't like to see him."—"But, Sir, what will be the consequence if Mr Pitt is dissatisfied, and his brothers and friends in open opposition?"—"Pitt will not oppose his own measures."—"No, but his friends will oppose everything else, and particularly the affairs of the Treasury; and when such immense sums are to be raised, it is always easy to find out objections."—"Well, lay your scheme before Mr Pitt; if he does not approve it, let him propose another."—"Perhaps, Sir, a very improper one."—"Well, you then will be justified."—"And the public service, Sir, disappointed. What satisfaction can that be to me? For God's sake, Sir, let me not carry a positive refusal that will ruin everything. Let me tell Mr Pitt your Majesty will consider it for a fortnight."—"Then he will have hopes."—"Yes, Sir."—"If you say anything of that kind, I will disavow you to Mr Pitt. I tell you, *I will be forced.*"—"For God's sake, Sir, don't say so. What an appearance will that have?"—I told him Mr Pitt said that His Majesty did not know that he was within two fingers' breadth of passing his reign in quiet and ease, or of not having an easy moment. I had my reason for saying it.—"Why, ay; is not that force?"—"Indeed, Sir, he did not speak of himself, he meant something else; what he meant I know not; he did not mean himself."—"*I will be forced.* The world shall see how I am used. I will have it known."—"What good, Sir, can arise from thence? Perhaps many may blame Mr Pitt's pushing it; but at the same time they will be sorry to see your affairs in confusion for such an object."—All the answer I could get was,—"*I will be forced.*"—And I was (I think) to acquaint Mr Pitt with what His Majesty had said. I concluded with saying that nothing but a sense of what was my duty could make me press so disagreeable a subject upon the King. I had before said that by granting this, I did verily believe everything would go well; without it, I saw no prospect of it.

I then made my full report to Mr Pitt, who received it with as much temper, as like a man, and as like a reasonable man as ever man received anything. He lamented very much his situation. He begged I would assure the King that he absolutely renounced force, that he neither proposed it, nor would accept it, upon that foot; what he wanted was the Garter *given*, not *taken*; that if it came by force, it wanted the only merit of it, viz: the mark of His Majesty's approbation; that he had no thoughts of quitting the King's service; that he would do the same, neither more nor less, for the King, both as King and Elector, than he would have done if this had been granted. He talked very feelingly of the part your Lordship, the Duke of Devonshire and myself had taken and said, What must be his case? When we three, naming us, assisted

by my Lady Yarmouth, could not procure such *a trifle*....That the King surely could not think much of his services and might reason, "A Peace is near and then I shall have no farther occasion for him."—But he would always do the best he could. And he would still flatter himself...that His Majesty would, from his own good sense or goodness, do that voluntarily, and as an act of grace, which he had declared he would be *forced to*. And I think he has still some hopes....He in a very cordial manner thanked me for the part I had taken, and I daresay he will do the same, both to your Lordship and the Duke of Devonshire....I forgot to mention when I excused myself for pressing a Garter so much and the King had said,—"Could not he give a Garter as he would?"—I replied—"There is another, Sir, that you may give to anybody."...But as a bad sign for my friend Holderness, he took an opportunity in the course of my audience to abuse Holderness and talk slighter of him;—that he could not depend upon him; that he did not know what to do with him, etc.;—than he has done for some months past.

Ill news does not always come alone. My friend Legge, I find, is now giving himself airs, and will not return from the country till his wife has the peerage.

KENSINGTON, *Sept. 28th*, 1759.

To proceed in my narrative, which ends full as ill as it began.... I began [with the King] by relating the proper and handsome manner in which Mr Pitt had received the King's answer, the other day, and the hopes he would still entertain that His Majesty would do this as an act of his grace and favour, and that Mr Pitt renounced force, etc....The King continued still to refuse it, and to complain of Mr Pitt for insisting upon his giving the Garter to one so disagreeable to him, and who had insulted him. I made the usual answer, and then proceeded to read Mr Pitt's letter to me of yesterday[1]. He stopped me short and would not hear it. However I acquainted His Majesty with some material parts of it. It all signified nothing. He abused the style of the letter, "his eloquence," etc. and once said,—"Well, now, I see I am to be *wheedled* sometimes, *force* sometimes, *wheedling* to bring about what you want. I see it very plainly, I am nothing and wish to be gone."—"Sir, I hope your Majesty won't talk so. And you will neither think it advisable or practicable?"—"Practicable, what do you mean? Nobody can force anything upon me (meaning this Kingdom), if I don't like it."—"Well, Sir, then I must make the best answer I can to Mr Pitt conveying this refusal."—To that no answer.—

[1] N. 211, f. 128. Printed in the *Chatham Corr.* i. 433, dated September 27th, written in Pitt's characteristic style. One phrase ran: "All I mean at present to trouble your Grace upon is to desire that, when next my reluctant steps carry me up the stairs of Kensington, and mix me with the dust of the ante-chamber, I may learn, once for all, whether the King continues finally inexorable and obdurate to all such united entreaties and remonstrances, as (me and mine excepted) never fail of success."

"I have done my duty, Sir; I have told you my own opinion and that of others and I have done—."...But now, my dear Lord, what is to be done? [How could he possibly go on without Pitt's support and with] the great Lord Holderness laughing at the distresses of both of us....

Write fully to me... ; that is always a great comfort to me.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 211, f. 170.] WIMPOLE, *Sep. 29th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD...

All that I can say...is that you have done all that man could possibly do, and more than could naturally have been expected; and Mr Pitt must be much wanting in gratitude and good breeding if he did not acknowledge it in the strongest manner, and make his brother fully sensible of it. How long that will serve, I will not pretend to prophesy, but common decency must produce some good from it for the present.

To take the result in a short view. The King firmly adheres to his negative with marks of great ill-humour; declares that he will be forced, which imports that he will not do the thing without being forced; but I think it imports something more, that he expects to be forced. A strange and unroyal declaration! and I think in good sense, leaves some room for Mr Pitt's inference that his Majesty may at last, from his own cooler judgment, do that in some sort or degree voluntarily, which he has so frankly declared "he will be forced to." But I cannot agree with Mr Pitt in his reply to what the King said, "that he did not desire that this should be a secret," viz. "that neither did he (Mr Pitt) desire it should be a secret; that the world would then see the King had refused it; that *he* had asked it and been refused, and that he desired to leave it there." This is very high talk, and surely he cannot judge so ill as to think of it so lightly; for as strongly as I profess my opinion for the thing being done, and as sincerely and heartily as I wish it, I do not, in my conscience, think that there is one man in England, unless the Common Council of London, that will think that this request, under all the circumstances of the person concerned, the nature of the honour in question and the reasons alleged by his Majesty for his aversion to it, is reasonable to be pressed by Mr Pitt in this manner. Nor would anybody else thus press it upon the King, but *for his own sake*, and that is the whole merit of the cause. Mr Pitt disclaims force; but there is

no disguising it, it is force. I remember that in 1745, when the King was pushed to make this gentleman himself Secretary at War and we were all quitting for it, he himself, the party concerned, thought fit totally to disclaim force, had no thought of the resignations, and would concur in the support of the King's measures without taking any place at all, which I think he did till the Paymaster became vacant[1]. In my opinion, he would do wisely now to give my Lord Temple that advice, and persuade his Lordship to appear to make it his own option to waive it for the present. In this he would meet with universal approbation....

I really can say no more. To confess the truth, I am quite tired of such unreasonable people and such unreasonable points....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 211, f. 394.] HAGUE, *October 9th*, 1759.

...As a lover of peace, I take the liberty to send your Grace for your amusement the correspondence of a female politician, who has likewise wrote to M. de Hellen[2]. I paid no attention to her first letter (which is undoubtedly in a fictitious name), except to examine as far as we could from whence these letters could come; and I have good reason to think they are wrote by the Dowager Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst (mother to the Grand Duchess of Russia), who has been at Paris some time, who loves intrigues and has veered about in her politics very frequently.

The second letter arrived today, and to make her talk more I have wrote her an answer of no consequence which I likewise send the copy of, in which I treat her notions as I thought it was right to do in the present circumstances[3]. This lady is very intimate at Versailles, and we shall soon see whether she has anything further to say. At least, she will have contributed a little to our diversion....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke [*endorsed in Lord Hardwicke's hand;*] *The first mention of the letters from la Dame Inconnue.*

[N. 212, f. 87; H. 71, f. 6.] *October 15th*, 1759.

...[He had made another attempt to get Lord Temple's Garter, but the King had replied—"My Lord, I will not be bullied into it, I will not give it him." He describes the variations in Pitt's temper, who now entirely refused to explain to Lord Temple the circumstances which had attended the refusal of the Garter, or inform him of the support which the Duke and his friends had given him—a great injustice. The King had been delighted with Joe's answer to

[1] See vol. i. 426, 503.
[2] Prussian envoy at the Hague.
[3] p. 22.

the *Inconnue* and declared it] was the prettiest letter he ever saw in his life. He told my Lady Yarmouth so and showed it to her, who commended it in the highest degree; and indeed it is a very pretty and a very proper letter; there is great prudence with great politeness and wit....I should have desired your opinion, as Joe's correspondent may become a lady of consequence. I think, if you approve it, I should send back the letters to be sent to my Lord Holderness in form[1]....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 212, f. 138.] *October 16th*, 1759.

[Desires that the Duke will send him his ideas for the draft of the Speech; laments the King's resolution against giving Lord Temple the Garter but feels sure that Pitt has informed, or will inform, Lord Temple of the whole history of the affair and of the part the Duke took in it.]

...Much honour has been done to Joe by the commendations bestowed on his correspondence with *l'Inconnue*. It is indeed a very pretty and prudent letter. But if he and Mons. de Hellen are not sure of *the person*, I should much doubt whether it comes from a lady of such rank and so famous for intrigue, as the Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst. To me there is something low and poor in the letters. But the comfort I derive from this incident is, that I see it is so much known in France that their Court pants after peace, that such sort of people think to make a merit with them by having a finger in opening the door to it....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 212, f. 285; H. 71, f. 17.] *October 22nd*, 1759.

...I am in haste to acquaint you with a very extraordinary and most embarrassing letter, which I have this moment received from Mr Pitt. I always feared poor Joe's sending me those cursed female letters would bring on something of this kind. Last night the great Lord Holderness told me that he had "found out," or by some means it had come to his knowledge, that Major-General Yorke had sent me two letters from a lady at Paris, relating to peace; that he thought it his duty to acquaint Mr Pitt with it; that as it was in his, Lord Holderness's province, Mr Pitt might not suspect him. I was a little surprised, but immediately said it was an affair of no consequence, that I intended to send the letters back to Yorke that he might send them to his Lordship. This morning, or rather this moment, I received this letter from Mr Pitt.

[1] See also the Duke's letter to General Yorke of October 16th. (f. 128.)

Was there ever such a part played by man, so wicked a one as this by Lord Holderness, to destroy the King's affairs, to make Mr Pitt outrageous and particularly so with Joe Yorke and myself? I hope you approve my answer to Mr Pitt. I think it will be impossible for me to go on with these gentlemen.

Kensington, 4 o'clock. I have made a full report of this wicked story to the King and showed him Pitt's letter, my answer to Pitt and my letter to Major-General Yorke, which I send you again that you may remember it; for nothing can be stronger "than that Yorke should send them to his Secretary of State, who can alone make use of them." I showed the King the wickedness of Lord Holderness, and the confusion he had brought upon his affairs. I told him also that this would be made use of by Mr Pitt to fling the refusal of the Garter upon me. His Majesty said, as to Lord Holderness, he was "Pitt's footman." I said he ought to have spoke to me first, before he had blowed up Mr Pitt; but the King answered, "He is Pitt's footman." His Majesty said the affair of the Garter was his own. Pitt could not fling it upon me. I showed him how impossible it was to go on upon this foot—at least for me. His Majesty treated that as ridiculous, and so passed off the discourse. It was very much otherwise with the lady. She apprehends the worst consequences from it. I told her very plainly that I could not, and would not, go on upon this foot with these two gentlemen....She is thoroughly frightened, and says she will talk very strongly to the King and let me know on Thursday....She says she does not, nor ever did admire Holderness; and though she don't directly say so, she sees the villainy of this behaviour. I told her plainly that she could do more with both the Secretaries than anybody; that my Lord Holderness would not act in this manner, if he did not think he had support *somewhere*, and I often hinted to her her friendship for him. She denied it, but owned she had a friendship and partiality for my lady who, by the bye, has done a great deal of mischief. I told her plainly that Lord Holderness's view was to hurt Yorke and me. She did not deny it. She said Holderness had always been jealous of our correspondence, and thought that I had done him hurt by Yorke, both as to the complaint of Bothmer[1] last year against Lord Holderness, and also as to the negotiation of the Dutch Commissaries. In short, my dear Lord, thus this silly, or rather wicked, affair stands. I think Pitt will fly out. The Garter is at the bottom of it, and I hear every day that without the Garter everything will be in confusion.

Pray send me word, as soon as you can have digested your own thoughts upon it, what you would have me do further in this unhappy affair, in which Joe and I are equally principals and consequently equally aimed at by Lord Holderness certainly, and

[1] Count Hans Caspar von Bothmer, Danish Ambassador in England. He had complained about the seizure of the King of Denmark's wine by privateers in July, 1758. (N. 202, ff. 289, 343.) The Dutch Commissaries had come to London to discuss the points in dispute between the two powers.

possibly by the other person. I have done nothing without the King's knowledge and approbation. Lady Yarmouth told me Lord Holderness had always told Mr Pitt that I had a secret correspondence with Major-General Yorke; but I never heard that Pitt spoke of it to her, and only once or twice (I think last year) mentioned it to me. Lady Yarmouth told me this was a very unhappy affair; with those, who knew what had passed, would be thought of as it was; but might be blown up with others, either ignorant or ill-intentioned, to produce a very bad effect....

I am always yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Right Hon. William Pitt to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 212, f. 304.] *October 23rd*, 1759.

MY LORD,

I understand your Grace has received some days since a letter from Mr Yorke, relating to certain dapplings [*sic*] for peace on the part of some lady (supposed to be the Dowager Princess of Zerbst), together with Mr Yorke's answer to the same. As it is so indispensably the right of a Secretary of State to be informed *instantly* of every transaction of this nature, and as the King's service and the public good must be essentially and incurably prejudiced by such suppressions, in a moment so critical that one false step may prove fatal, I find myself necessitated to mention this matter to your Grace. I know not how far your Grace may have had the King's orders for this clandestine proceeding; if such be His Majesty's pleasure, it is my duty to receive it with all possible respect and submission; but I must find myself thereby deprived of the means of doing His Majesty any service....

Your Grace's most obedient and most humble servant,

W. PITT.

Duke of Newcastle to Mr Pitt

[N. 212, f. 306.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 23rd*, 1759.

DEAR SIR,

The enclosed letters and my answer to Mr Yorke will, I hope, convince you that this is an affair of no serious consequence whatever, and I am sure sent to me purely for amusement. I knew not one word of it when I received it. I read it to the King for amusement only. I was determined to say not one word upon it, but to send it back, as I should have done this very night, if I did not send the letters to you.

I would not enter into any correspondence of business, and

especially relating to peace, with Mr Yorke or any of the King's ministers whatever, upon any account in the world. I am as innocent and as ignorant of everything relating to this affair, if it be of consequence, as any man alive. You know the whole now, and I hope you will not think there is the least design of any kind in it. I was sorry when it was sent me; and determined to send it back to him again to be sent to my Lord Holderness, as the only proper person who could make use of it, if it should come out to be anything[1]. I am most sincerely sorry for this incident, which should give you one moment's uneasiness. I hope, however, that I have removed it. If Major-General Yorke had looked upon it as a point of business, I am sure he would have sent it to my Lord Holderness, as I have desired him to do, which must take off all suspicion of my having any part in it or the least design to have anything to do in it, if contrary to expectation it should come out to be anything.

I hope I shall soon have the pleasure to see you perfectly recovered in your health. I am, with great respect etc.,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. I shall not fail to acquaint the King with what you mention about the state of your health.

Right Hon. William Pitt to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 212, f. 314.] HAYES, *October 23rd*, 1759.

MY LORD,

I return herewith the letters with which your Grace has honoured me, and will enter no further into this matter than to observe the date of Mr Yorke's letter and that of the trouble I am now giving your Grace. The interval is not inconsiderable, and much mischief has been done in less time. Mr Yorke's letter, I think, with all who have read it, very pretty; but I cannot help differing with your Grace in not thinking that any letter, however prettily termed and addressed to the amiable sex, ought to be deemed matter of amusement, when it relates to the great subject of peace. I am not the least surprised that Mr Yorke should write as agreeably as Voiture; but I confess I am much so to find a letter on so grave a subject, wrote without permission from hence, and afterwards suppressed here and concealed from those, who have the best right from their office to receive the earliest notice of all incidents of this important, and, I fear, very dangerous nature. I acknowledge my unfitness for the high station where His Majesty has been pleased to place me; but while the King deigns to continue me there, I trust it is not presumption to lay myself at His Majesty's feet, and most humbly request his gracious permission to retire, whenever His Majesty thinks it for his service to

[1] Printed so far in *Chatham Corr.* i. 445.

treat of a peace in the vehicle of letters of amusement, and to order his servants to conceal, under so thin a covering, the first dawnings of information relative to so high and delicate an object.

I am, with great respect,

Your Grace's most obedient and most humble Servant,

W. PITT.

[On the 24th October (N. 212, f. 342) the Duke of Newcastle sends the above letter to Lady Yarmouth, observing that his own, which proves his innocence, has not made any impression upon Mr Pitt.]

Earl of Holderness to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 212, f. 316; H. 71, f. 64.] LONDON, *October 23rd*, 1759.

Je ne bouderai point, mon cher Général. Je vous estime trop pour ne point entrer en explication avec vous. Je suis, je vous l'avouerai, naturellement, un peu piqué de certaine lettre femelle, que vous avez envoyée en Angleterre, et qui renferme quelques pourparlers dont on n'aurait pas dû me faire mystère. Il est délicat d'oublier votre correspondant régulier dans une matière où les moindres bagatelles sont importantes. Je vous avouerai de plus, qu'ayant senti l'inconvénient d'une correspondance à la sourdine, je souhaite qu'elle soit discontinuée. I have told you my grievance with as little formality as possible, and can only add that I should be extremely concerned that any incident should make an hitch in the freedom of our correspondence.

I am, with the truest regard, dear sir,

Your most obedient, humble Servant,

HOLDERNESS.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 212, f. 350.] *October 24th*, 1759.

...I am much concerned about the trick Lord Holderness has played relating to the two letters from the lady at Paris. I am sure that neither your Grace nor I have deserved this treatment from his Lordship; neither, as I am confident, has Joe deserved it. The design was very malignant and may do much real mischief, as well in a public as in a private light. I don't see that anything can prevent it, unless Mr Pitt should happen to read the original letters in some cool moment, and be convinced of the nothingness

of them. As your Grace has already communicated them to Mr Pitt, I don't see why you should not, instead of sending them back to Joe, communicate them to Lord Holderness. That seems to be the shortest and most natural way, unless there is anything in Joe's letter which conveyed them to your Grace, not proper to be communicated.

Your Grace's letter to Mr Pitt is certainly a very proper one, and contains but three words which I wish were not there. I mean when you say "I was sorry when they were sent me." This may be construed by them as if your Grace yourself condemned Joe for having sent them to you, of which they may take advantage against him. Your Grace did not give any such hint in your letter to me on the subject, and you know very well that it was by your command that he entered upon, and continued, this correspondence, in order that you might have the most early intelligence and all anecdotes in the first instance, and be enabled to be the first to inform, or even entertain, the King with such pieces. And surely, considering the situation your Grace is in, at the head of the King's administration, a minister employed abroad cannot be blamed for making the first communication to you of such matters of curiosity as are not yet become, and perhaps may never become, the subject of business. His Majesty also has authorised and approved this correspondence, and therefore I do not entertain the least doubt but he will find His Majesty's and your Grace's powerful protection, if any complaint should be made of his conduct in this delicate affair. Mr Pitt cannot hurt your Grace with the King, but he may be able to do so by so insignificant a person as Joe Yorke. I therefore beg leave to implore protection for him in the strongest manner*....The King seems to have taken this matter in a right light, and I hope he will adhere.

I do not quite like Lady Yarmouth's way of talking on Lord Holderness's subject. I cannot make the distinction between my Lord and my Lady, and I know the latter is much obliged to your Grace as well as the former, and the former has also some obligations to me. I think this unhappy affair should be cleared up and put an end to as soon as possible; for if it is suffered to hang, it may be worked up into a design of a clandestine negotiation of peace. I have reason to think Lord Holderness has a design to go as first Plenipotentiary to the Congress himself, and so set Joe

* I am, and was, sorry that my Father made use of such *humiliating expressions*. H. (H. 71, f. 60.)

aside entirely from being one, and this may be at the bottom of this malicious manœuvre....

I am, with the greatest attachment and affection, my dearest Lord,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 212, f. 371; H. 71, f. 32.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 25th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I send your Lordship a copy of Mr Pitt's answer and of my letter transmitting it to my Lady Yarmouth, according to her desire. The first requires no other comment but that it is worse than the former, and shows plainly that this pretext is to be kept up till either the points in view are obtained, or some other offers, which Mr Pitt may think will even serve his purpose better than this. The view is to show resentment, and let that resentment fall upon me. Upon my arrival at Kensington this morning I...found ...that she [Lady Yarmouth] had not showed Mr Pitt's letter to me to the King....She ran out against my Lord Holderness as the worst of men; that this was so wicked, so malicious a part that it could be done only with a view to confound the whole, and to show his spleen and resentment to Major-General Yorke and to hurt me and everybody; that she remembered the part he acted three years ago[1]; that she could not bear to hear of him, etc.; that the King was highly enraged at him, and would treat him with the greatest marks of resentment for what he had done, but *that*, she thought, should be avoided at present and wished I would prevent it, which I readily agreed to endeavour to do, as I was of her opinion that bare scolding Lord Holderness upon this occasion would do no good and might be misinterpreted by Mr Pitt. She said that Lord Holderness's view was to be first Plenipotentiary at the Congress; to exclude Yorke, with whom he was highly offended; that he had long been endeavouring to blow up Mr Pitt upon Yorke's correspondence with me; that she did not know that he had ever succeeded before this instance (which shows that Pitt had other reasons for flying out now); that I must talk to the King and see what he would do, and to that purpose.

Accordingly, I went to His Majesty who smilingly came up to me immediately; "Well, what answer have you from Pitt?"—"A very bad one, Sir."—I then read it distinctly and emphatically. The King seemed attentive, but I think knew it before. I then told him the answer might mean to quit or not, just as he pleased, and that I should not be surprised if he should send his dismission

[1] The reference is perhaps to his sudden abandonment of the Duke of Newcastle for Pitt.

even before Monday.—"Oh! he won't quit his own schemes and measures; I will tell him he can't."—"Suppose, Sir, he don't, who can go on to do your Majesty's business in such a situation? Does your Majesty think it possible for me to go on with receiving such threatening letters twice or thrice a week?"—"My Lord, you must bear what I bear."—"Very true, Sir, if by bearing I could carry on your Majesty's affairs; they can't go on without Mr Pitt, and nobody can go on with him except he is brought into good humour. It is not Yorke's correspondence that is the point; it is, Sir, another object which has been refused him, and thus it will be, now and then one thing, now and then another, if his great object is not attained."—"My Lord, I know what you mean; you have tormented me often enough upon that subject; pray do it no more."—"I don't torment you about it, Sir, I only tell you the truth."—His Majesty had said early—"You shall not leave me; you must not leave me."—"Leave you, Sir, I don't talk of leaving you, but I can be of no service to you in this situation of things."—He then reproached me with having brought in Pitt, and connected myself with him. I told him nothing else would then do, and talked of the real acquisition of strength and credit from his successes, which he had got since. I then presumed to ask His Majesty whether he thought that this war, at this immense expense, could have been carried on without the unanimity of the people, the popularity, the Common Council, etc., which was entirely owing to Mr Pitt, so that it could not have been done without him. To which I had no answer. But I think I got out a sort of secret. His Majesty showing very properly that this thing was a mere trifle, not liable in any degree to the interpretation Mr Pitt puts upon it, as an endeavour to carry on clandestinely a negotiation of peace, said very remarkably—"Besides, he knows I told him I would not make peace without him, or but in concert with him."...

...[The King treated Lord Holderness with great contempt, but said he would not say a word on the subject to him.] I then mentioned your Lordship's concern upon this incident; that you hoped His Majesty did not blame your son, and that he would continue to have His Majesty's protection.—"No, quite otherwise, my Lord; pray assure my Lord Hardwicke that I have an extreme good opinion of Yorke and am mightily pleased with him."—I then told the King that I had heard that Lord Holderness's view was to be first Plenipotentiary at the Congress.—"He, my Lord, no, I have so good an opinion of Yorke that I have designed," or "long designed" or to that purpose, "that he should be second plenipotentiary."—This should convince your Lordship that nobody can do your son hurt with the King, but I beg it may not be mentioned even to Major-General Yorke; for such a declaration would at this time of jealousy do great hurt, and by refinement be connected with the anonymous letters. Your Lordship sees, I have taken care of your son. You say nobody can do me hurt*.

* "'With the King' were my words." [Note by Lord H.]

I wish I found it so. My situation, thought a favourite in the Closet, with power to do but few things there and scarce daring to do even those few things; my situation, I say, puts it in the power of almost everybody to hurt me every hour of the day. Alone and unsupported in the administration, attacked daily with offensive speeches, or if I escape them at Court, have some letters of reproach or menace the next morning. Nobody can, or does, exhibit any remedy whilst I am in, or suggest any method for my getting out. I will bear as long as I can. My patience will not last for ever. My friends should think for me....

Kensington, Oct. 26th, 1759. *Friday near* 4 *o'clock*....I asked His Majesty—"Suppose Mr Pitt should quit, how does your Majesty propose to have your affairs carried on?"—He said—"You can do it; you have the majority of the House of Commons."—I replied...—"No one will have a majority at present against Mr Pitt. No man, Sir, will, in the present conjuncture, set his face against Mr Pitt in the House of Commons. This will do everything; without it nothing can be done."—"My Lord, I will not do it; *I will be forced*; if I am confined and bound or tied (I think was the word), I must do it. I will not do it otherwise."—"For God's sake, Sir, don't talk so. I am sure Mr Pitt has no thought of that kind, force or anything like it."—...His Majesty said—"Don't go now and torment my Lady Yarmouth again."—"I shall not torment her, Sir, she knows how things are as well as I."—

I send you a copy of my letter to Joe. I write nothing else from prudence to him this post....

I am afraid the affair of the Garter is desperate. I am positive Mr Pitt's ill-humour and impracticability with me will continue. He waits for a handle to quit....Forgive me, my dear Lord, you say a great deal about Lord Holderness, whom I despise, and scarce think of, and can do what I please with, if it was not for Mr Pitt; and you say little about Mr Pitt. [He begs for advice what to do if Pitt quits, or insists upon Joe being censured or the correspondence ceasing. He will not agree to the two last.]

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 212, f. 404.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 26th,* 1759.

[Gives an account of what has happened.]...I must desire that, for the future, you would transmit to my Lord Holderness...anything that may further pass upon this subject, who, as I observed to you in my letter of the 16th (the only one that I have sent to you upon this subject), is the only person who can make any use of it, or send you any orders from the King upon it....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Holderness

[N. 212, f. 402; H. 71, f. 66.]

HAGUE, *Oct. 26th*, 1759. One o'clock after midnight.

MY LORD,

If ever I was surprised in my life, it was upon the receipt of your Lordship's letter....I had no thought either of pleasing or offending; nor did I think it one moment of consequence enough to conceal it from either man or woman in this town, to whom I talked of it and laughed about it as it deserved; and I thought sending it as a *plaisanterie* to any one person in England was sufficient to spread it there as I had done here. The insinuation therefore that your Lordship makes, as if it was a *mystery*, which in my ministerial capacity, I should not have concealed from his Majesty's Secretary of State, is a little hard....As to what your Lordship says, "qu'ayant senti l'inconvénient d'une correspondance à la sourdine, vous souhaitez qu'elle soit discontinuée," does your Lordship mean the correspondence with the anonymous writer? If that is your intention, it is already ceased; for I have heard no more about it. If it is any other correspondence, you will be pleased to let me know what it is expected I should do....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 212, f. 440.] WIMPOLE, *October 28th*, 1759.

[He tells the Duke of his illness, an acute internal pain, and describes other symptoms from which he has now recovered. He thanks the Duke for his support of Joe; regrets that the King still remains obdurate in the matter of Lord Temple's Garter, on which everything turned, and expresses doubts of Lady Yarmouth's sincerity.] As to Mr Pitt's answer to your Grace, there can be but one opinion about it, and I subscribe entirely to yours. The view is to make a *querelle d'Allemagne*, in order to help towards gaining the main point; for he cannot be serious in the inferences he pretends to make. There is no altering him without new making him and stripping him of his popularity, which is now greater than ever. *But he will not quit.* I agree with the King that he will not quit his own schemes and measures. He won't quit the vain-glory of appearing in Parliament at the head of this great system, crowned with all these laurels. Neither would he be willing to have it said that he quitted because His Majesty would not give Lord Temple a Garter....Your Grace reproves me for saying so much about that Lord [Holderness]. I should not have done it, but that he is art and part in the affair in question; and the whole proceeds originally

from his malignity. Besides, how can any man be insignificant in such a station, who has taken such a strong turn of intrigue against you and whom, you own, you dare not turn out, though you certainly have the power to do so, because you don't know how to fill his place without doing more mischief. Such a man in such circumstances may be of great significancy, tho' merely as an instrument or a tool, and must be either got rid of or managed. She [Lady Yarmouth] wishes to prevent the first, and I don't find the King appeared inclined to it now.

As to the three questions on which your Grace begs advice; first, if Mr Pitt should quit. I think that will not happen; but if it should, I think your Grace cannot possibly go on....You answered truly that nobody will set their face against him in the House of Commons, and that will be found stronger after all this success than ever before....As to the second, if it should be insisted to send any reprimand or disapprobation to Major-General Yorke for his communication to you, the resolution you have taken never to agree to it is extremely wise and right. If nobody's son was concerned in it, I should be of the same opinion; for it highly concerns your own honour. As to the third, if it should be insisted that this private correspondence should be stopped or limited as to the objects, I think the same, and in this the King's honour is also concerned; for I think it was begun by his direction, and has been carried on under his inspection....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 378.] HAGUE, *Oct.* 30*th*, 1759.

...I must confess that my principal takes it very high for one who is so sparing in his correspondence in all quarters, and whose continuance in the post he holds astonishes, and has long astonished, all who have any connexions with England, and who are ignorant of the motley composition of our ministry. I hope your Lordship will think I kept my temper and answer'd properly, tho' I should be sorry you could imagine I was insensible upon such an occasion, as I neither did nor meant wrong....Your Lordship knows my situation, the rise and progress of my correspondence with the Duke of Newcastle, and how little satisfaction I reap from it; for so unlucky have I been, that this correspondence, which offends Lord Holderness so much, has not in appearance ever pleased his Grace. As the King knows I write to him, and never disapproved, it did not become me to hesitate; but, as far as I have been able to judge, I have endeavoured to separate the materials for my

different letters so as to please both; tho' I always felt it was next to impossible, because each likes to be the bearer of what he thinks will be agreeable, and when it transpires that one has received what the other has not, it is I who bear the blame.

In this silly affair his Lordship has worked up a molehill into a mountain and, under pretence of the public good, vents his spleen against me for having sent to the other what had amused the King for a minute....I think it a little hard, after having the King's approbation, to be reproved so smartly for nothing, and still more so that if his Grace choose I should write to him, that he should not countenance and protect me in obeying his orders, for without that I neither do him nor myself any service. It is at the same time true that his Grace, when he wants business to be done, knows how to inform and instruct, and does it fully, whereas the other loves writing and business so little that one is obliged to guess what he wants; and if his Lordship's correspondence with the ministers in his department circulates, as was formerly the custom, you will have seen with your own eyes in what manner business is done in his office....For what reason I can't tell, but I have never had the art to captivate his Lordship's good will, and from the time of my succeeding him here, which he was pleased to think a high presumption in one so insignificant, to this time, I have had frequent opportunities of feeling I was no favourite. When the King gave me the regiment of dragoons, he could not bring himself even to make me a compliment. However, as nothing in this life is free from disagreeable incidents, as his Lordship's significance in his country never alarmed me, and as I had never any intention but to serve the King as well as I am able, I never troubled your Lordship, nor hardly myself about it.

...Probably some bickerings will have happened in England upon it, and I suspect it was owing to them that I had no letter from the Duke of Newcastle by the last post. Give me leave to say at the same time that, if that is the cause of his omitting to write, and that an inferior like me is to suffer for endeavouring to please without offending everybody, and not to be countenanced afterwards, the King's service may be esteemed very honourable, but I shall think myself bound to consult my own private honour for my future continuance in it. A Secretary of State is by his office a very respectable person for his subalterns, but the Earl of Holderness, as a private man, is no more than I am....I hope in good time to have a word of information and advice from your Lordship as the greatest honour and support to....

Your Lordship's [etc.],

JOSEPH YORKE.

Hon. John Yorke to Viscount Royston

[H. 26, f. 162.] WIMPOLE, *October 30th*, 1759.

DEAR BROTHER,

...My Lord seemed more in spirits yesterday than the day before, so that he was able, after you left us, to make a draft of a Speech for his Majesty, which he told me he could not have done on the preceding day. His appetite was also good, and at night he declared that the soreness of which he complains was lessened. I told him after dinner that the Doctor wished him to go to town as soon as he could for reasons of prudence, not of immediate necessity, and that he had desired me to tell him so. All the answer my Lord made me was that he could not go sooner than he could. He slept well last night....I observe that his voice is come more to itself, and his looks are mended....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 71, f. 40; N. 212, f. 512.] *October 31st*, 1759.

...[Pitt] then began to speak of Yorke's correspondence, and though he said some things which neither Yorke nor I should like, the whole was said with seeming decency and good humour. He lamented it as what he thought might have serious ill consequences. I went into the whole with him, and endeavoured to show how immaterial it was and how little I thought it of consequence. He could not agree with me. Everything relating to peace was of consequence. And he laid his stress upon two points, that Yorke should not have encouraged the correspondence, answered the letters, encouraged the Lady (who was certainly the Princess of Zerbst) to explain herself further, and particularly have mentioned the word *limits* in his letter, which, he said, was the great point in question, without having orders from hence for so doing, and that I should have communicated it to the persons more immediately concerned. I told him then very truly that, as to my Lord Holderness, I owed him no attention, but that I had had it really under consideration whether I should show it to him (Mr Pitt) or not; that the only reason I did not do it, was the fear of giving jealousy that I had suppressed other things, which I had not done, I mean of the same sort or things of consequence. Mr Pitt said that that might have been a reason, but, however, he wished it had been done. When I protested to him that I would not enter into any separate negotiation for peace on any account in the world, he then said, not very politely, if I did, I should not be able to walk the streets without a guard. I took no other notice of that but to infer still stronger, for that reason, that it was impossible for me to do it. He seemed much to criticize upon my calling it a correspondence of amusement. In that he must differ. He did think (supposing, as he admitted, that I had no view in it) Yorke should

not have answered the letters or mentioned the word *limits* without order; that ill use might be made of it by France at the Court of Spain, where, whilst we were talking one language, the French ambassador might produce Yorke's letter to show how forward we were for peace, and were encouraging a direct negotiation with them for it. I did not agree with him and told him plainly that, if Yorke had seen it in any such light, or in any serious light, I was sure he would have sent it to my Lord Holderness as, he saw, I had desired him to do in my letter in answer to Yorke's letter to me. He then only said that, if ever this matter should come seriously before him into consideration, he must then declare his opinion that Yorke did wrong in answering the letters without order.

Your Lordship will see by Count Viry's paper[1] from whence all this arises; that Lord Holderness not only suggested these objections, particularly that with regard to *limits*, to Mr Pitt to blow him up upon it, but also most wickedly and treacherously to my Lord Bute. I read Viry's paper to the King. It made a very great impression upon his Majesty....The King said—"I hate and detest Holderness, as much as you do. I don't know what to do with him. Let Viry endeavour to set Pitt against him...."

[Pitt had spoken in the same terms about the affair to Lady Yarmouth. The latter said to the Duke]—"I will tell you the King's scheme, if Mr Pitt quits. He means that Yorke should succeed him."—"Does he," said I, "madam, I am sure that Mr Yorke would not undertake it. I am sure his Father would not suffer him to do it, to expose himself to certain ruin and destruction."—She entirely agreed with me. It has not stopped there. His Majesty (I think yesterday), when I was talking upon supporting Gen. Yorke and not suffering any slur to be put upon him, having in view a particular point which I shall mention afterwards, the King said—"No, I approve Yorke, I love him; and to show I do so, if at any time Pitt should go out, I think of Yorke to succeed him."—"That, Sir," said I, "is impossible. To succeed Mr Pitt, I am sure he will not; he cannot."—"You mistake me," says the King, "I don't mean now, I mean any future time."—"If, Sir," said I, "Mr Pitt should like to have Mr Yorke Secretary with him, that might do."—But that did not seem the King's object. If, however, his system should be to be carried on, Lord Holderness must be removed some way or other, and with Mr Pitt's consent. His Majesty then again talked to me about the Plenipotentiaries for the Congress. He designed Gen. Yorke for the second. He knew his zeal, he knew Yorke would serve him if he could, and support *his affairs*. "But, my Lord, you must think of some Lord, I won't have Holderness."—"Sir, *I hope* not."—"I have been thinking of my Lord Egremont....Pray think of one—who will support my business."

It may be proper for us to think amongst ourselves, but the supporting "the King's business" must not be the object of our choice....

[1] N. 212, f. 498.

[Pitt proposed that Prince Louis of Brunswick at the Hague should be employed to negotiate for a peace, but the Duke of Newcastle suspected that there was some design to slight Joe in this scheme by not communicating the affair to him or employing him, and these suspicions he had expressed to the King, who had declared that "Yorke must know it." It had therefore been arranged that Gen. Yorke should be apprised of the negotiation after the preliminary communication....]

[On November 1st, 1759 (H. 4, f. 129), Lord Hardwicke writes to Lord Royston on the subject of his own illness, which the doctors have now declared to be a tendency to a rupture. The prospect is but a melancholy one, but what enjoyment of life can anybody expect after 69?] And I have the greatest reason thankfully and devoutly to adore the Divine Providence for that long continuance of ease, health and spirits which I have enjoyed. Durum! sed levius fit patientia quicquid corrigere est nefas.

[On November 1st, 1759 (N. 213, f. 22), Lord Mansfield writes to the Duke of Newcastle:] As to the letters I am convinced Pitt, in his own mind, don't think seriously about it; that he neither is angry with Yorke nor your Grace upon that point. He won't attempt to hurt Yorke. His colleague certainly will. I am fully persuaded that they use C[ount] V[iry] as a canal through which to convey what they wish you to be told....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 213, f. 13.] WIMPOLE, Thursday night, *Nov. 1st*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I am infinitely obliged to your Grace for the kind concern you are pleased to express for my health. [Describes various symptoms.] In my present state, I am utterly unable to enter into the business of your Grace's letter, but I have read over the papers, and will be considering them together with the letter by reflection in the meantime.

I have no objection to the answer proposed to be given to Denmark, nor *to the matter* of the Declaration to be made to the ministers of France and Vienna. But I own *the manner* in which you have all agreed to do it, hurts me extremely, and gives me more uneasiness than, in my present weak state, I am well able to bear. Your Grace remembers that the former protocol was for making the communication by the ministers of Great Britain and Prussia at the Hague, and nothing has happened to give rise to

this change but the two letters of the *Inconnue*. I look upon it as a formed design to ruin my son, and I think the contrivers of it have half accomplished it already. Your Grace said in your last letter that you were absolutely resolved never to agree to any *reprimand or disapprobation*. In this I said I thought you were right, and that your own honour required it. Can there possibly be a stronger act of *disapprobation*, or even *reprimand*, than passing him by in this manner in so solemn a transaction at the very place of his residence. How will it expose him in the eyes of Mons. d'Affry[1], and to the ridicule of the French party there?

Your Grace says you found by Mr Pitt's discourse, "that he was displeased with Yorke for what he had done, even independently of his sending the letters to you." Indeed, my dear Lord, that is all colour. There is no other offence but the sending the letters to your Grace, and their not being communicated, either by him or you, to Lord Holderness and Mr Pitt. The answer sent was pressed by Mons. de Hellen, was quite innocent and without consequence, and the word *limits*, as it stands, is nothing, unless it be unlawful to use the word *limits* at all.

My Lord Holderness now thinks he has completed his revenge. Your Grace knows that you commanded this young man to enter into, and continue, this correspondence. You know how obedient he has been to your orders, how much pleasure you took in this correspondence, and how often you have reproved or reproached him for any intermission of furnishing you with anecdotes. I am persuaded, if he had sent these two letters to Holderness, you would have found fault with him for it and said, why does he send them to him, who neither can, nor will, make any use of them?

I beg your Grace will consider how strange it appears on the face of the protocol. It is to be kept an absolute secret from his Majesty's minister at the Hague, but it is to be forthwith communicated to Mr Keith at Petersburg, to Lord Bristol, and even Lord Marishal at Madrid, and even to Mr Mackenzie at Turin. Why are any [of] these more fit to be entrusted with such a secret than General Yorke? Can there be a greater mark of disgrace and contempt?*

Nothing has been writ to Joe either by me or from me, since I first heard of this unlucky affair. So I can have done no mischief

[1] French minister at the Hague.

* Here, through pain and fatigue, I omitted to take notice of what the D. of N. himself says of the King's declaring, that he would have the Declaration and whole transaction communicated to Maj.-Gen. Y. and that he (the D. of N.) dissuaded his Majesty from it. H. 71, f. 62.

yet, but he will certainly know it and, I presume, think himself given up.

The first three or four days after my coming to town, I must devote to the consideration of, and attention to, my health. The first time I shall be able to pay my duty to his Majesty, I shall take the liberty to tell him my thoughts of the affair in respect of the part which Lord Holderness and Mr Pitt have taken, which is insidious in them both. I now look upon myself as soon to go off the stage of the world, but I should be sorry that any branch of me should continue upon it with dishonour. Therefore, if nothing shall be done to set this matter right, I am determined at a proper time, not only to advise him but to lay my command upon him, to desire *to be recalled.*

I thought it due to the great respect and affection, which I truly bear for your Grace, and to that friendship with which you have so long honoured me, to lay my thoughts upon this affair thus clearly before you....

[He encloses the draft for the Speech.]

I beg your Grace would not mention the nature of my present complaint to anybody.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Earl of Holderness

[H. 71, f. 74.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, 1759.

MY LORD,

I received the honour of your Lordship's letter* of...and was never more astonished in my life, than to find you express any surprise at my reserve to you. I desire your Lordship will condescend to recollect the whole tenor of my behaviour towards you, from the time you had the good fortune to come into office. At the same time, reflect on your late behaviour towards me, in the person of my son, Major-General Yorke, and then examine your own breast, what were the motives that induced you to that behaviour. When this is done, even your Lordship will not be at a loss to find out the reasons, which have determined the present conduct of, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most humble Servant,

[HARDWICKE].

* This letter of Lord Holderness is not remaining....H.

Earl of Holderness to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 213, f. 42; H. 71, f. 68. Copy.] LONDON, *Nov. 2nd*, 1759.

SIR,

At the time I wrote to you on the 23rd past, I had not seen the two anonymous letters you had received, or the answers you had returned to them. They were communicated to me soon after; and I cannot but wonder you should think them so great a *bagatelle*. The correspondence *à la sourdine*, I alluded to and wished to be discontinued, was the private correspondence to the Duke of Newcastle without my privity, which I think has been hurtful to the King's affairs, as I know you have been misled by it; and it has been most unkindly and most undeservedly made use of to my prejudice by his Grace. An irregular correspondence of this kind must create confusion in business, and uneasiness to those who carry it on. You have taken my letter upon a more serious tone than I intended it. It is against the Duke of Newcastle, not against General Yorke, that I am piqued. I have endeavoured to make the properest return to the frankness of your correspondence, and am persuaded your best friends here know I have never been deficient in any act of friendship towards you. I am still desirous of continuing upon the same terms, if you think it worth cultivating. I am with great truth and regard, Sir,

Your most obedient and humble Servant,

HOLDERNESS.

[On November 3, 1759 (*Chatham Corr.* i. 448), the Duke of Newcastle sends to Pitt the draft of the Speech from the Throne, which he has received from Lord Hardwicke, who is too unwell and who has not sufficient strength or spirits to make any further alterations.]

Duke of Newcastle's Memorandum for the King.

[N. 213, f. 81.] *November 4th*, 1759.

Lord Hardwicke's letter; his illness; his uneasiness about G. Yorke. To have the full communication made; if Lord Hardwicke withdraws, impracticable for me to go on....

[On November 6, 1759 (N. 213, f. 134; H. 71, f. 70), General Yorke expresses to Lord Holderness his satisfaction that it is not with him that his Lordship is piqued; observes that his correspondence with the Duke of Newcastle has been known to Lord Holderness ever since the Duke gave up his office of Secretary of State, and that he has never followed any orders except those that came from his Lordship; of any ill use made of it he is entirely ignorant....]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 213, f. 143; H. 71, f. 57.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *November 6th*, 1759.

MY DEAREST LORD,

[Expresses his joy at the improvement in Lord Hardwicke's health]....I shall make the King very happy....His Majesty was under the greatest concern....My own anxiety...I shall not mention....I beg you would not think of business for a fortnight.... I send you the Speech back....It is the finest Speech I ever read....

I come now to that part of your Lordship's letter which, next to the first part, gives me more real uneasiness than anything else could do. I beg only that it may give you none. I will answer for it; all shall be set right. Leave it to the Solicitor[1] and me, and I will add another person, the King. He knows the whole; he sees the whole, and will do whatever we desire him. He has given me instructions to write to Joe, and I shall do it. Be easy; all shall be right, and Joe's honour and ease of mind fully taken care of and secured*....

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 213, f. 136; H. 9, f. 382.] KENSINGTON, *November 6th*, 1759.

...Be easy, don't think that I blame you, or am capable to give you up; and I am sure you will not interpret my letter of the 26th of last month in a very different light from what I intended it. Let me have the continuance of your instructive and agreeable correspondence. But whenever *peace* is named to you, or any act of business upon which you may want orders, write to your *cordial* Secretary. You may, if you think proper, give me a hint at the same time, because I don't see sometimes the office letters in many days....

Ever sincerely and most unalterably yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[General Yorke thanks the Duke for the letter on November 9th, which he calls "a true cordial to his spirits." (H. 9, f. 384.)]

[1] Charles Yorke.

* My Lord's illness was a fever arising from the pain of a rupture, not immediately discovered. It was greatly aggravated by the unlucky incident of the *Inconnue*, and he never forgave Lord Holderness, who he thought had obligations to him, the share he had in blowing it up. H. (H. 71, f. 55.)

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 213, f. 156.] WIMPOLE, *Wednesday, Novr. 7th*, 1759, two o'clock.

MY DEAREST LORD,

...It is impossible for me sufficiently to thank you for the many affectionate and tender expressions of your concern for my health....Thanks be to God I have grown better and better...and... if I go on thus, I propose to set out from hence on Friday in the forenoon....

Your Grace is very good in considering an old invalid friend and humble servant so much....But I look upon myself now as a piece of cracked china, that may be put together so as to stand a little while on a cabinet for a sorry show, but that never can be made fit for service. Whilst I can be of any, his Majesty and your Grace may depend upon me.

I will not say one word about poor Joe, because I do with confidence rely upon the entire effect of what your Grace has given me an assurance of, relating to him....I am with the sincerest attachment and affection, entirely yours as long as I shall continue to be

HARDWICKE.

[He encloses a paper of corrections of the Speech.]

[*Endorsed by Lord Hardwicke.*] *From Major-General Yorke to his brother the Solicitor-General*

[H. 9, f. 386.] *November 10th*, 1759.

DEAR BROTHER,

...Give me leave in the first place to thank you from the bottom of my heart for the affectionate concern you have showed for me....There is no doubt but Lord Holderness sought for an opportunity to draw me out of this position. He has long foreseen that it gave me an opportunity of recommending myself.... You will recollect, as proofs of what I advance, the extraordinary proposal of sending Mr Townshend here under the pretence of my being wanted to say *ay* in Parliament, the proposal of sending me to Spain when there was nothing to do there, the expedition to Moravia last year, and several other circumstances which accompanied it[1]. All his endeavours proved abortive....I remember very well that, during the time the disputes with Holland were at the height, he pretended that I did not act up to the letter of my

[1] p. 131.

instructions owing to contrary insinuations I received from other quarters, and that I had represented him in Holland as the great obstacle of our reconciliation. I explained the state of the case to Lord George Sackville last winter, as he went thro' here, and Lord Holderness wrote me word some time after that he was perfectly satisfied, and had never meant anything against me but against those who wrote to me. Things had rubb'd on pretty quietly till this last flurry....I saw immediately the Duke of Newcastle was to be attacked, and that to come at him I was to serve as a pretext....

To say the truth, the intrigue about excluding me from the secret of the first step to be taken by Prince Louis gives me little concern, and I wonder those who *proposed* the exclusion, or who were so *weak* as to *permit* it, could ever imagine that his Highness had so little friendship for me as to conceal it from me....He accordingly show'd me Lord Holderness's and Knyphausen's letters.... He highly disapproved the mystery that was made of it to me, and concluded by assuring me that he would be *wiser* than they were in England, and would upon his honour conceal nothing from me. Thus, you see, I am doubly in the secret, and yet excluded from it....

In all this disagreeable affair, nothing has vexed me more than to find myself *eternally* link'd to a man, who never thinks of anything but himself, and who would sacrifice the best friends he ever had in his life, if he foresaw the least disagreeable consequence to himself. He makes business so disagreeable by that means that, upon my word, notwithstanding his Majesty's gracious intentions in my favour and his partiality for me, if I am intended to be employed at a Congress under Lord Holderness's *papier mâché* correspondence, and with an unavow'd one with his Grace, I desire none of it....You yourself have been an eye and ear witness of the courage and sagacity of the Duke of Newcastle. If he has not Lord Hardwicke continually at his elbow, he will care little for any of his children....The conduct of Mr Knyphausen[1] in this affair too shocks me a good deal....If any man ever deserved well of another, I do from everything called *Prussian*. I have past myself into a proverb to serve them....

I know nothing but what you tell me of the share Mr Secretary Pitt has in this transaction; nor can I believe him serious, when he affects to treat the frivolous correspondence with the *Lady* as an affair of consequence, much less as a capital fault. I rather think he suspected more at first from Lord Holderness's report, and did not care to own he had been too hasty, especially as he found the Duke of Newcastle so tame about it. In all the intercourse I have

[1] The Prussian envoy imagined that there was a real attempt to make peace unknown to Pitt, and without the King of Prussia, and seems to have been the person who communicated the existence of the unfortunate letters to Lord Holderness. See pp. 24 *n.*, 97.

had with Mr Pitt, he has treated me with the greatest regard and show of esteem, and by the last post I had a letter from Mr Wood[1] (to whom I had sent a private letter from Prince Ferdinand to Mr Pitt), full of acknowledgments for my care of the letter and attention to him. So you see there are more private correspondences than one, and that I am the *sink*, thro' which they pass, and treated as such by those I endeavour to please....I suppose much will depend upon the turn all this will take after Lord Hardwicke's coming to London....God grant he may soon be well enough to enjoy life and bless his family. As to yourself, my dear Charles, I am so used to your friendship and good offices, that I am not surprised at anything you do; but the pains you spent upon me in the hurry of your own business, and with a mind still tender from a wound I am afraid of touching[2], enhanced greatly the value of the obligation....

Ever your obliged,

JOSEPH YORKE*.

[On November 14, 1759 (N. 213, f. 249; H. 71, f. 75), the Duke of Newcastle announces to Lord Hardwicke the resignation by Lord Temple of the Privy Seal. He deplores his hard situation, but will never change the love and affection, gratitude and respect which he has felt for Lord Hardwicke for 40 years.

Lord Hardwicke answers the same day from Grosvenor Square (N. 213, f. 251). He has suffered a return of sickness.] What all this, with my other great infirmity, will end in, God only knows, and to his good Providence I resign myself. [He regrets the resignation, and wishes for health more than ever that he might be of some use.]

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Anson

[Anson MSS, Add. 15956, f. 40.]

GROSVENOR SQUARE, *November 14th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

I have been reflecting upon what passed between your Lordship and me last night, and I have judged it necessary to give you this trouble. I wish you could make it convenient for you to see the Duke of Newcastle this forenoon, either at Newcastle House

[1] Robert Wood (1717–1771) traveller and author; Under Secretary of State 1756–1763.

[2] The death of his wife.

* It would have been well if Sir Joseph had shown half this feeling and resentment at two most unfortunate periods (I mean to the family); first when the D. of N. and Lord H. took their leave of the King's business in 1762, and second in 1765 when the Seals were given to Lord Camden. H. [These remarks do not seem just or appropriate.]

(which would be best) or else at Court, before the House of Lords comes with their address. I beg further that you would tell him something of what passed between us two last night, and tell him as many of the strong things, which I said, as you can recollect; the stronger you represent them the better; that from what his Grace said to your Lordship, I feared his various occupations had not allowed him time to consider my letter from Wimpole of the first of this month by Barnesley[1]; that, as to what is passed, I was only confirmed in the same opinion which is there expressed at large. But my desire is to look *forwards*, which, in general, must depend upon events; that for the present, my resolution is—*that until this unhappy affair of Joe is set right, I will not set my foot within the House of Lords. I will not come near the Court, nor hear one word upon any public business; that from this resolution the King's civil list shall not move me.*

I think this will alarm his Grace; and the first thing he will think of will be to come to me, either as he comes from St James's to-day, or at night. Both these I would avoid. The first would hurt me in my present state by keeping me from my dinner; the last by keeping me up till midnight. I therefore beg your Lordship would, in a kind, confidential way, say to his Grace, "You had better let Charles and me talk to him before you see him. I found his mind was much agitated and heated; and he owned it was this hindered his sleeping. We will see him this evening; you need not suspect our blowing him up—we will only calm and make him more easy."

If I know his Grace, he will be thankful for this, and it will bring it to what I have wanted ever since I came to town, to have a full conversation with your Lordship, Lord Royston and Charles (whom I consider as part of myself and on whom I can rely) to settle what is fit to be done for my honour and Joe's interest, before I talk with anybody else on the subject. I desire this for two reasons: first, the thing is rightest in itself; secondly, I own I dare not trust myself to an impetuous conversation with the Duke of Newcastle in my present state. I should be in danger of losing my temper, and of hurting the cause, or myself, or both.

If this scheme takes place, I wish your Lordship could be here between seven and eight this evening, or as much earlier as you please. Let me know if you can, and I will appoint Charles. He

[1] Above, p. 80.

may get away early from the Serjeants' feast. If this meeting cannot be tonight, I shall like it as well tomorrow, provided the Duke of Newcastle can be decently kept off in the meantime. Be so good as to let me hear a word from you; forgive this trouble and

Believe me [etc., etc.],

HARDWICKE.

My love to my Lady. I had no very good night, but better than the former, and am this morning much as yesterday morning. Tho' I have named Lord Royston (which was my desire), yet I don't imagine he can come out now, nor do I expect him.

Lady Anson to Lord Royston

[H. 28, f. 131.] *Nov.* 14, [1759].

DEAR LORD ROYSTON,

My Lord has desired me to send you the enclosed letter, upon which I need make no comment. I own I have always apprehended the affair, which is the subject of it, to have had a great share in that unusual, and otherwise in a great degree unaccountable, appearance of Lord H[ardwicke]'s spirits. I am, however, so far rather better pleased that he seems rousing a little to act upon the occasion. May it end to his future ease and satisfaction, which are principally to be regarded, and which appear to me to depend greatly upon the turn this affair may take; and I therefore wish I saw the way to a good end of it a little more clearly.

Lord A[nson] has been with the Duke of Newcastle to alarm him according to the intention of the enclosed letter....His Grace talked of sending to talk to Charles upon it, but we all think it best that Charles should not see his Grace till he had first seen Lord H[ardwicke]—and Charles himself, who has just come in, is of the same opinion. He will therefore endeavour to attend Lord H[ardwicke] (tho' he happens to be deeply engaged) this evening, as will my Lord, and it is very unlucky that you cannot go out too. My Lord will call upon you on his way to Grosvenor Square....Ever your most faithful, etc.,

E. A.

[On November 15, 1759 (N. 213, f. 263; H. 71, f. 78), the Duke of Newcastle writes to Lord Hardwicke giving him encouragement on the subject of his health, on the strength of the opinion of the doctors which he has received, and thanks him for his assurances of affection.] My love, affection and gratitude can never alter. Difficulties must make them increase, when those difficulties can be lessened only by that friendship, advice and confidence, which has for so many years been my only comfort and support.

[He writes again the same night (N. 213, f. 265; H. 71, ff. 80 and 82) that Lord Temple's affair has been at last amicably settled. He had asked the King's pardon, and been subsequently promised the Garter.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 213, f. 277; H. 71, f. 97.]

GROSVENOR SQUARE, Friday, *Nov. 16th*, 1759, 11 o'clock.

MY DEAREST LORD,

Your Grace's kind letter, just now received, tho' writ last night, has given me the greatest comfort, as the first desire of my soul is to see union and good harmony restored, the King thoroughly supported, and his Majesty's business carried on with complete success; which can only be effected by preserving his administration entire and cemented. Whatever be my own lot, I should die with comfort, could I see security and ease secured to his Majesty for the remainder of his invaluable life.

It gives me the greatest pleasure to hear that my Lord Temple has behaved with so much temper, decency and respect on this occasion; and I look with admiration on his Majesty's conduct, so truly generous and so full of greatness of mind.

It is my most hearty wish that my Lord Temple may take the Privy Seal into his hands again immediately, if such shall be his Majesty's royal pleasure. Nothing has yet been done, that I know of, which can give occasion to his wanting a new patent. I long with impatience to hear a happy result of the whole. This would tend to make me better in every respect, and I shall live in hopes of seeing your Grace quite happy after your return from Claremont on Monday....

I am, my dearest Lord, with the truest attachment and affection,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

P.S. I have confined my letter to what concerns the King, because I did not know but you might think fit to read it, insignificant as it is, to his Majesty. But be assured, my dear Lord, that my concern for your Grace is not the less and that the support, comfort and satisfaction which you will personally receive, is as cordially interesting to me as any part of the whole.

I wish your Grace would let Mr Pitt know my opinion, and the part I have acted on this occasion....H.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 213, f. 284; H. 71, f. 86.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *November 16th*, 1759.

MY DEAREST LORD,

[Describes the events and negotiations leading up to the gift of the Garter to Lord Temple, and the latter's resumption of the Privy Seal. The King had endeavoured to strike a bargain with Pitt and to secure his "dédommagements" at the Congress, but Pitt had maintained a firm attitude; and the Duke subsequently had held the same, or still stronger and clearer, language to the King, who had expressed great disgust and declared that they might do what they wished this winter, and then he "would leave them" and "go to Hanover."] I stop in the middle of my letter to give you, my dearest Lord, all the thanks that a sincere, devoted and grateful friend can give you for the most affectionate, the most generous, the most truly disinterested and noble letter that ever man wrote to a friend of his own, on any public or private occasion. What must that man be, not yet totally recovered from a painful illness, not altogether easy upon what does and should affect him, who is capable of thinking and writing in the manner you, my dearest Lord, do upon the important event of my Lord Temple? No man ever did it before. I question whether any man will ever do it hereafter. My heart is too full to say any more. I must show this letter and note to all the world. The one ought to be your pride, the other is mine....I showed Mr Pitt both your letter and note, and the Duke of Devonshire and my Lord Temple the letter. They all expressed their sense of the greatness of your way of thinking and writing....There is one thing remarkable and that is, that whenever I tell the King an opinion he don't like from any other person, his Majesty always has something *agreeable* [*i.e.* disagreeable] to say of them. Whenever it is your Lordship's case, the King is always silent....

[On November 18, 1759 (N. 213, f. 332), the Duke of Newcastle writes to Charles Yorke, the Solicitor-General, sending letters connected with General Joseph Yorke's affair, and asking for directions from Lord Hardwicke as to his future action.]

[The same day (N. 213, f. 334) Lord Hardwicke announces to the Duke that he has received a visit from Lord Temple, "who is the happiest man in the world[1]," but with whose conversation he was much fatigued, tho' he had every reason to be satisfied with it. He writes again on the evening of the same day.]

[1] His letter to Lord Hardwicke, H. 248, f. 40.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 213, f. 336.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *November 18th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

I sit down to acquaint your Grace that my Lord Temple's visit of last night has produced me the honour of a visit from Mr Pitt this night. He sent to propose it, much to my surprise, who thought he would not come to town till tomorrow morning. He was in exceeding good humour; expressed the highest satisfaction, and said everything you could wish both upon your Grace's subject and mine.

I gave him a full detail of Joe's unlucky affair, the vexation it had given me, the strange, undeserved part which my Lord Holderness had taken, and my way of thinking upon it. But I assure your Grace, upon my honour, that I did not make the least complaint, or hint the least dissatisfaction to him upon anything you had done. Whatever my complaints upon that head have been, they have been the secret lamentations of a friend and faithful servant, not divulged to anybody but those of my own family, to whom your Grace first disclosed it. Mr Pitt was as obliging and, in appearance, as cordial as possible; treats it as the slightest thing in the world, and has promised me in the strongest manner to do everything that I would have him upon it, and in this view has promised to talk with your Grace upon it tomorrow at Court. There I leave it for the present.

Whilst I am writing, Charles comes to me and shows me the pacquet your Grace had done him the honour to send him. It is impossible for me to venture to fling out an opinion *instanter* upon what is proper to be done to repair Joe's honour, and set this matter right. But I will think of it, and beg that your Grace will do so. No answer can be sent to Prince Louis till Tuesday. I have read your copy of Prince Louis's answer. I differ from my Lord Holderness and think his Highness has not accepted; for he makes it a condition that he "must acquaint the Dutch ministry with the whole." This is inconsistent with all the principles you have gone upon here, and you will immediately give them a handle to demand to be let into the mediation. Besides, are the Frenchified Dutch ministers to be made acquainted with it, and the King's minister

at the Hague to be excluded? Will the Earl of Holderness take this upon him?...I am, my dearest Lord,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 133.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, Monday morn., *Nov. 19th*, 1759.

DEAR ROYSTON,

...You acted so well-judged a part, and so kind to me yesterday, that you have a right to know what passed. I had the honour of a visit of two hours, which passed with the greatest good humour, satisfaction and reconnaissance to me, that you can imagine. "It did make him very happy." I went thro' the whole with him, and happen'd luckily to be in so good spirits that I was almost as eloquent as he. I went thro' the whole of Joe's affair from beginning to end. I will tell you how I began.—"I had a favour to beg of him, not upon the foot of modern connections, but of old friendship; not as from the *Earl of Hardwicke* to the *Secretary of State*; but as from the old *Baron of Hardwicke* to *Mr William Pitt*." I immediately saw this had a good effect. I then stated the whole, and fully detail'd my Lord Holderness's part *en son plein jour*, without mincing anything, and yet without using one harsh word. He was struck with it; said, *I need not have said the tithe of what I had said to make him do whatever I pleased on this subject.* To make short, he said everything I could wish and more than I expected, treated the thing as the slightest thing in the world, and faithfully promised me that he would come into, and support, anything and everything that I should desire or propose to give me satisfaction, repair Joe in point of honour and set the whole right; and that he would of himself talk with the Duke of Newcastle upon it at Court this forenoon. The proof of the pudding will then be known. I have let the Duke of Newcastle know all this....

And now, dear Royston, let me thank you for all your goodness and attention both to me and Joe. When I hear more, you shall know it; and, in the meantime, give my affectionate compliments to dear Lady Grey and the babies, and let me hear that you are better, which is the first wish of

Yours most affectionately,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Right Hon. William Pitt

[N. 213, f. 350.]

NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *November 19th*, 1759, near five o'clock.

DEAR SIR,

I am just come from my Lord Hardwicke, who is very low and by no means able to have the meeting at his house, with which I have acquainted my Lord Holderness.

Lord Hardwicke is extremely sensible of your civility and friendship. The affair of his son hangs very heavy upon his spirits, and I dare say retards his recovery. Upon talking fully over to him what it might be proper to do, he dictated to me the words in the enclosed paper, and desired I would send them to you, and he was persuaded you would have no objection to them. This will make him quite easy; and I can assure you, is not meant to carry anything with them but what my Lord thinks necessary to show the Prince that there is no design to exclude the King's minister from a proper knowledge of what is doing. I can answer for it, nothing is meant that you can disapprove. I hope you will agree to what Lord Hardwicke proposes. He is so set upon the words that, if any alteration is proposed, it would give him the greatest uneasiness. This being the state of the case, you may imagine I must most earnestly desire your concurrence in it.

I am, Dear Sir, Your most affectionate humble Servant,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Paper enclosed in the Duke of Newcastle's letter to Mr Pitt of November 19, 1759.

[N. 213, f. 352; H. 71, f. 103 and f. 106.]

Lord Hardwicke proposes, That in case Prince Louis should accept to make the Declaration proposed, his Majesty would be pleased to authorise and desire Prince Louis to make the Declaration and proceed in concert with his Majesty's Minister at the Hague, and that the King's Minister there should be informed by the Secretary of State here by his Majesty's order of all that has passed.

N.B. It is not meant that the King's Minister should be present at the time that the communication shall be made by Prince Louis to the Ministers of the three Powers.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 213, f. 396; H. 71, f. 101.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *November 20th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

I hope the good account I am to send your Lordship of what passed last night, will add to the good night you had, and to the benefit you will receive from it. I sent the paper with a proper letter to Mr Pitt, who dined with the Speaker. The moment I saw him at my Lord Holderness's, he said he extremely approved the paper, thought it very right and begged me to propose it. He accompanied it with the strongest professions of his never having had any intention to do anything that could be thought a slight to Mr Yorke, and was therefore very desirous to do anything that might convince him of it. My Lord Holderness opened the business to the Lords....His Lordship talked of a general communication to the King's ministers abroad. I then produced my paper, introducing it with my reasons that the King's minister at the Hague should not be excluded, or have any appearance of a slight put upon him. My Lord Holderness seemed agitated, and said that the only reason he had to object to it was, it carried with it an appearance as if Mr Yorke had been slighted, or as if there was a design to do something that might carry a slight with it; that it was the furthest from his thoughts; and during the whole time his Lordship had a smile and air of contempt of everything that I proposed. Mr Pitt took it up warmly and kindly, protested he never had any intention to do anything that could be slighting, and in short extremely approved the paper. I think then the Prussian ministers came in. I acquainted them, that the Lords were all agreed that orders should be sent, agreeably to the substance of the paper.

My Lord Holderness then put down some words at the end of his letter to Prince Louis, that his Highness might talk in confidence to Mr Yorke and Mons. Hellen upon the subject of it. I disliked that method extremely; that we had nothing to do with Mons. Hellen; the Prussian ministers might inform him if they thought proper; that my point was not to pass by the King's minister, and I renewed my proposal contained in the paper. My Lord President was strongly, and continued so to the last, against the word *concert*, that that was making Yorke the *judge*; Mr Pitt, my Lord Mansfield and myself as strongly for it, and Mr Pitt proposed that the Prince should be desired *d'agir de concert* with the King's minister. That I thought the whole and Knyphausen, upon that, drew the enclosed paper, which was determined and is stronger, better and more agreeable to the form of business than my paper. Lord Holderness behaved as pertly and as impertinently as ever man did through the whole, Mr Pitt as warmly and as friendlily as man could do; and indeed, Mr Pitt, Lord Mansfield

and myself did the whole thing. I shall give a full account of the whole this evening to Joe. I am persuaded he will be fully satisfied. I really think this, in all its circumstances, is an *amende honorable*. If it eases your mind, it makes me happy at once....I wish only to know by two lines how you like the paragraph[1]....

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 213, f. 399; H. 71, f. 106.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *November 20th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am infinitely obliged to your Grace for the trouble you have taken in informing me so fully of what passed last night, and for the very kind and zealous part which you took in procuring any step to be agreed to which might, in some measure, repair the injury which had been so undeservedly done to my son's honour and mine, and permit me to add also, to your own. It is an additional instance of your goodness, which I shall never forget.

I am well satisfied with the paragraph enclosed in your Grace's letter as to so much of this complicated affair as relates to the transaction abroad, provided Major-General Yorke shall be so; but every man carries his own honour in his own hands and he is the proper judge of it, and therefore I cannot answer for him till I hear from him.

But there remains for consideration what is proper to be done to set matters right at home, and to make those who have done the wrong, feel that they have done so*.

I am with all the cordial sentiments of attachment and affection possible, my dear Lord,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

[1] H. 71, f. 108. It was worded strictly in accordance with Lord Hardwicke's note above.

* It was difficult to carry through this resentment, without implicating Mr Pitt, who was too *big* to be meddled with. H. [Lord Holderness was, moreover, in favour at Leicester House.]

Duke of Newcastle to Maj.-Gen. the Hon. Joseph Yorke at the Hague

[N. 213, f. 381.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *November 20th*, 1759.

DEAR SIR,

I can now speak out, and will do it with the greatest truth, confidence and friendship. You may have seen that I have always mumbled the first point, viz. what had passed upon the incident of the letters you sent me from the *Inconnue*, and that I have been totally silent upon the last, viz. the letter wrote to Prince Louis, proposing to him to deliver a paper in the name of the King and the King of Prussia to the ministers of France, Vienna and Russia, declaring the disposition of the King and the King of Prussia for the meeting of a Congress for a general peace.

As to the first, the fact was as I related it to you. The umbrage and jealousy arising from it were great. The first discovery was made by my Lord Holderness and communicated to Mr Pitt, without asking me any previous question about it, in order to create a misunderstanding between Mr Pitt and me, and to revenge himself and satisfy his malice and ill-will to you and me. It succeeded for some time.

I received Mr Pitt's letters of complaint, and made such answers, as were founded upon truth and as I thought were prudent to calm and quiet things. The expression in my letter, "that I wished you had not sent them to me," has given offence and is interpreted as in some measure giving you up. Far was that from my intention. The fact was true; not from an opinion that you had done wrong, but from the knowledge I had of the jealousy of some people and of the malice, little tricks and duplicity of others. Had I done what your family would afterwards have wished me to have done, avowed the separate correspondence, owned it was by the King's order, etc., heated as minds were then, it might, it would, have occasioned an immediate breach, and you innocently would have been thought the cause of it.

The same thing would have happened upon the second point....

The King told me Mr Pitt thought that it would be more for the dignity of the two Powers that the Declaration should be delivered by Prince Louis to the other ministers, than directly from our own. I own at first I did not dislike it; but upon consideration I was not sure that something was not meant. However I said nothing. We met at night. The channel of Prince Louis was fixed, and as nobody could know that no other method had ever been thought of, it was impossible for you or anybody to suspect, or imagine, that making use of that channel was, or could be, interpreted as the least slight to you or passing you by. At our meeting, Mr Knyphausen said that it was absolutely necessary that this first overture to Prince Louis (which

was barely to ask him whether he would accept the commission or not) should be kept an absolute secret from the Dutch ministers, "et même vis-à-vis des ministres de l'Angleterre et de la Prusse à la Haye[1]."

I was not insensible that some slight might not be possibly couched upon this pretence. I considered with myself, alone as I then was[2], and unsupported as I generally am, what it might be proper to do for your sake and my own. I determined within myself that, if I opposed it, one of two things would happen; a total disavowal of any design or intention to carry any slight with it, but only for the greater secrecy; that could not well have been combated. But what I feared, and what undoubtedly would have happened, was that the true reason would have been avowed and supported; that the secret correspondence with me and the suppression of overtures of peace would have been openly alleged, as the cause of this reserve and restriction. I had nothing then to appeal to but the merits of the cause; and, dear Sir, in these days of violence of extasy, dry merits avail little; the whole would have fallen upon you and me.

I thought, therefore, that the letting that go which was in reality no more than asking Prince Louis a question would, as it has done, give time to set everything right; or at least to make a stand when the orders should be sent to Prince Louis, and when any material act of consequence was to be done in consequence of Prince Louis's compliance, if that should be the case. I however *alone*, and without the knowledge or advice of any of your family, always informed the King of the whole; had his promise and authority with me, and was fully secured that nothing material could, or should, be sent without your having ample communication of the whole. What has passed has convinced me, and I am sure will convince you, if you can think coolly and impartially upon your own subject, that I was in the right. And to show how prudent it is, in things of the utmost consequence, not to take hasty resolutions, a most happy alteration in the system of ministry at home has happened in this last interval.... My Lord Temple is returned into the King's service; all ill-humour is removed; my Lord Temple and Mr Pitt are in the best disposition imaginable...and that poor wretch, Lord Holderness, is left to himself....My Lord Hardwicke went through the whole history of your affair; and Mr Pitt showed, and has actually proved, his readiness to do everything in the world to convince Lord Hardwicke and yourself that he had no intention to do anything slighting, or (*what is certainly true*) that he was most ready to set everything right, and show all possible regard to you in the carrying on this affair.

I was yesterday with my Lord Hardwicke. I found him pleased with Mr Pitt, but still greatly agitated on your account.

[1] p. 86 *n*.

[2] On account of Lord Hardwicke's illness.

As I was determined to do from the beginning *whatever* he wished or advised, I desired him to let me know what he would have done. He then dictated to me the paper enclosed[1] [which Mr Pitt had readily accepted.]...And to confirm you as to what relates to yourself, I will give you a short account of what has passed this day. When I came into the Closet, the King asked me whether a full communication was made to you; that he had seen and approved my Lord Holderness's letter to Prince Louis, but he had not seen his letter to Yorke. The King desired that I would see it before it went, "and if you approve it," said His Majesty, "I shall be satisfied." A mark that the King did not think me indifferent about you, your interest and your honour. My Lord Holderness went into the Closet after me and when he came out, talked of other things. I asked him whether he had wrote his letter to you.—"Yes," and pulled out of his pocket a short insignificant letter of nothing, sending you only, as I remember, a copy of the declaration and of his letter, which goes this evening to Prince Louis. I thought it was vain to be arguing with or correcting him, and only observed to him that he was to send his first letter to Prince Louis and His Highness's answer. He said he would do it, but as I have not the least dependance upon his Lordship I send you both, No. 3 and No. 4. After this I had a full conversation with Mr Pitt, in which I returned him my sincere thanks for the very handsome and friendly part which he acted last night with regard to you, but that I could not but observe to him the little, peevish, contrary part which my Lord Holderness had acted upon the same occasion. Mr Pitt's answer was remarkable.—"I cannot say otherwise, and what surprised me more was that I (Pitt) saw my Lord Holderness before I came into the room with the Lords, and I endeavoured to prevent it."—I told him how much my Lord Hardwicke had at heart the doing something to set this matter right (that was the meaning of it but not the words), and that I thought we should do everything that could satisfy my Lord Hardwicke; and, said Mr Pitt,—"My Lord Holderness told me he entirely agreed with me."—I replied—"You don't know my Lord Holderness. He is the most *double* man that I ever knew in my life."—"Don't imagine, my Lord, that I have so little perspicuity as not to know my Lord Holderness."—As my Lord Hardwicke had given Mr Pitt a full relation of my Lord Holderness's great obligations to him thro' the course of many years, I made a short recapitulation of what I had done for his Lordship, from his being a whiffling Lord of the Bedchamber to his now being actually Secretary of State, thwarting and nosing me in everything and before everybody, in all our meetings. I can only say that Mr Pitt talks in such a manner as I have great reason to be pleased with, even upon this subject. Go on, write civilly and respectfully to him, but drop all professions of

[1] Above, p. 94.

obligations, etc....I did not think it worth while to correct Lord Holderness's silly short letter to you. It shows the folly and the malice of the man. I was determined to supply the defect of it by writing fully to you myself, and I shall tell Mr Pitt that I have done so....

Pray write me fully your thoughts upon the whole....Indeed, in our circumstances, prudence and a regard for the whole should make us accept excuses which, perhaps, may not always appear to be so clear in themselves, especially when there is a real disposition to do right for the future....Write to me fully and cordially. Mr Pitt shall never blame you for it.

I am, and ever have been,

Yours most sincerely,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Right Hon. William Pitt

[H. 75, f. 196; N. 214, f. 15; *Chatham MSS.* 39.]

GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov. 20th*, 1759.

DEAR SIR,

The Duke of Newcastle has just now informed me of the very kind part which you were pleased to take at the meeting last night, so agreeable to the obliging professions which you did me the honour to make on Sunday. I cannot delay one moment to return you my most hearty thanks for all the goodness you have shown, and all the trouble you have taken on this occasion. Be assured that the justest impressions of them will ever remain upon my mind.

I am always, with the greatest truth and respect,

Dear Sir, Your most obliged and most obedient humble servant,

HARDWICKE.

Right Hon. William Pitt to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 75, f. 197; N. 214, f. 17.] ST JAMES'S SQUARE, *Nov. 21st*, 1759.

MY LORD,

I cannot defer expressing to your Lordship the very sensible satisfaction I feel in having been able to contribute in the least to that of your Lordship. The value you are pleased to give, in so very obliging a manner, to the execution of your commands last night, deserves my best and most sincere thanks, which I beg

of your Lordship to accept together with every wish for the health and entire satisfaction of mind of a person so interesting to the Public as Lord Hardwicke.

I am, with perfect truth and respect,

Your Lordship's most obedient and obliged humble servant,

W. PITT.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 214, f. 13.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov. 21st*, 1759.

[Sends renewed thanks for the Duke's support in Joe's affair.] Your Grace knows that I differ in opinion with you as to what was properest to have been done upon the first breaking out of the late unhappy incident; and as I am so unhappy as to continue to do so, you will not be angry with me if I differ as to some of the reasonings, by which you support your own opinion in that letter[1]. But this is a matter of opinion and neither shall, nor can, alter that faithful attachment and constant affection, which I have invariably professed and observed to your Grace, and which I have made the pride of my life to persevere in.

[He is glad to hear of Mr Pitt's good disposition.] His way of talking of Lord Holderness is very remarkable; and I am persuaded that, as to himself, he would patiently part with him[2]. I give no opinion, but that that matter will deserve your consideration; for I know that noble Lord now talks without reserve that he meant nothing of what has lately passed against Major-General Yorke, but against the Duke of Newcastle; that it is the Duke of Newcastle who has used him ill, and against him he is piqued.

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 214, f. 50.] *Nov.* 23, 1759.

...I shall be very impatient for an answer to my last letter.... Your Father and the Solicitor-General seem now perfectly satisfied. I can never be easy till my best friend my Lord Hardwicke is so; but how it could enter any man's head that I was capable of deserting you is to me astonishing....

[1] The Duke's to General Yorke above, p. 97.

[2] Pitt had agreed with the D. of N.'s bad opinion of Lord Holderness, but had suggested that the latter was in favour at Leicester House and therefore dangerous to be touched. (f. 5, and below, p. 104.)

Maj.-Gen. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Right Hon. William Pitt

[H. 37, f. 140.] HAGUE, *Nov. 27th*, 1759.

SIR,

It is not possible for me to remain silent under the obligations I have to you, the confirmation of which I receive from all quarters of my family, as well as from the Duke of Newcastle....

Much has lately passed upon my subject, and I have innocently been the cause of some trouble to my friends, which is a kind of business I am unwilling to load them with. The Earl of Holderness, who gave rise to it, could not, I am sure, have any personal enmity to me. It is impossible that a respectful and an uniform conduct, confined to the business I am charged with, and endeavouring to give all the lights in my power, could offend any man of honour and application. In that case it was, at least, unkind to make me the instrument of hurting others; and I am confident, when the whole came to be examined, it did not amount even to a suspicion of concealing from His Majesty's Secretary of State anything material to the service of the Crown. Give me leave to state my personal situation. My Father, ever since I came to have the use of my reason, was a friend of the Duke of Newcastle: family respect and honest prejudice have rivetted in the children the affection of the Father; they would, indeed, ill repay his paternal care and tenderness, if they gave him a moment's uneasiness in the person of his friends. The Earl of Holderness, who came into office under the same influence, was well acquainted with these connexions and obligations, and was satisfied that I should have the trouble of corresponding with the Duke of Newcastle, as well as with himself. If anything had happened in England to make that improper, it would have been the part of a good natured man to have informed me of it, and I should have been able to have taken my resolution....

[He protested against his long and faithful diligence in the King's service being repaid in such kind, and the want of confidence in him now shown at headquarters. He adds expressions of gratitude and regard for Mr Pitt himself.]

Maj.-Gen. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 214, f. 134.] HAGUE, *Nov. 27th*, 1759.

MY LORD,

By the mail which arrived on Saturday last, I received the great honour of your Grace's very long and confidential letter of the 20th instant, and last night another of the 23rd. I am extremely sorry to have been the innocent cause of so much trouble to my friends....In general, I am very ready to adopt your Grace's advice that "prudence and a regard for the whole, should make us accept excuses, which perhaps may not always appear to be so clear

in themselves, especially when there is a real disposition to do right for the future."...My vanity had no share in my feelings upon this occasion, but the service of the King a great deal; for from the moment I should have been excluded, it became impossible for me to continue abroad any longer....I am very sensible...that the situation of our interior comes frequently in the way....What is the case at present? I correspond with your Grace, and for that reason am to be excluded from secrets in the direct channel, nay, am to receive no answers upon any points of business. Your Grace says you never go the same way as the Earl of Holderness. He pretends to be angry on his side, and Mr Pitt is by all accounts convinced that my Lord is to blame, and yet everything remains in the same situation....

I purposely avoid entering into too minute an answer to your Grace's confidential letter....I am afraid of making an ill return to your friendship, if I pretend to follow your Grace's reflexions step by step....If what has passed has been sufficient, I am ready to acquiesce, tho' I feel that, whilst my correspondence is thus cramped and fettered, and that suspicion and ill-humour are to supply the place of business, I can never hope to do much service, tho' it is a great satisfaction to me to be told under your own hand that I may continue to write freely to you and that Mr Pitt will approve it. But will your Grace and Mr Pitt give me orders? For unless you do that, I may be well-informed but I can't act; and the informations I may receive will be called crimes in the common channel of my correspondence. This is the situation I am in, to which I have designedly given no handle....

Your Grace's most obliged and most devoted humble servant,

JOSEPH YORKE.

[The Duke writes to General Yorke the same day (N. 214, f. 138).] If you think proper to correspond with an unfortunate old minister, proscribed by a young ——, I will promise you no ill use shall be made of your correspondence, except the communicating your letters to the King....Your Father has been at Court, is returned in perfect health, has done like himself and is quite easy and happy.

Memorandum by the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 214, f. 282.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Dec. 4th*, 1759.

D. Newcastle.
Lord Kinnoul.
Mr Stone.

Lord Holderness.—Lord Hardwicke still uneasy. Thinks I should at first have avowed the correspondence with General Yorke by the King's order.

Lord Hardwicke insists still that I should desire the King to tell my Lord Holderness that the correspondence was by his order; that H. M. would have it continued and my Lord Holderness should give no further trouble upon it.

N.B. The danger of the King's authorising in this manner a separate correspondence. Lord Hardwicke afraid for his son. In that case the D. of N. (to) concur to have the correspondence dropped....

[N. 215, f. 449, written out large, apparently for the King's use.]

That his Majesty should acquaint my Lord Holderness that he has heard of the letters which my Lord Holderness had wrote to Major-General Yorke, imputing to the Duke of Newcastle what his Majesty knows not to have had any foundation.—That his Majesty has seen and approved Major-General Yorke's correspondence.—That there was nothing in it that was liable to any objection. —That the correspondence was carried on with his knowledge and approbation, and now continued by his order, and that his Majesty expects that my Lord Holderness should not give any further trouble about it.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 213, f. 103; H. 71, f. 118.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Dec. 5th*, 1759.

[The King had again made complaints of Lord Holderness.]... I had a very long, confidential, free conversation with Mr Pitt upon Lord Holderness's subject, in which there was all the indifference showed to his Lordship and earnest desire to be connected with us that could be desired. [Pitt, however, refused to take any part in his dismissal, on account of the danger of alienating Leicester House, with which he himself was in some way connected, and said] There were times when circumstances and the man made it more prudent to overlook and pass by what had passed....He disclaimed any notion or pretence that Mr Yorke should not correspond with any of his Majesty's ministers, as well as the Secretaries, but that in the business part, *the affair of peace*, it should be a concurrent correspondence....His present disposition seems such as we could wish it....*.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 214, f. 301.] *Dec. 5th*, 1759. At night.

...I have no letter from Joe by these mails and have only seen one to his sister Anson, in which not one word is said relative to the late affair. I am sorry that your Grace should be dissatisfied with any letter of his. I can answer for him that he meant

* The D. of N. was always on the fidgets about something or other, else his situation now seemed good. H.

nothing ill, and more especially disrespectful to you, but everybody will have their own sensibilities upon matters concerning themselves.

I am extremely obliged to your Grace for giving me so full an account of your conversation with Mr Pitt on my Lord Holderness's subject. It amounts just to the same thing as he has more than once said before. The whole turned upon the question of *removing* that Lord, which, your Grace knows, I have thought, ever since I came to town, that neither the King nor Mr Pitt would agree to. For my own part, I am quite indifferent about it, any otherwise than as it concerns your Grace's authority and ease, upon which I always lay great weight. But as to any other consideration, your Grace has heard me frequently say that I am far from desiring it. Indeed, I do not think it practicable at present. In such a situation I am always for resorting to what is practicable; and I think that what I took the liberty to propose the other night is so, and if his Majesty will condescend to it, will do good. I own I am convinced that such an avowal of the private correspondence by the King is become necessary for your Grace's honour, as well as for other considerations[1].

I hope your Grace keeps free from colds this North-East wind, which will keep me from Leicester House to-morrow.

I am, my dear Lord,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Lord Royston to the Solicitor-General

[H. 12, f. 296.] *Dec. 6th*, 1759.

DEAR BROTHER,

My Lord seemed (I cannot say surprised) but vexed at the Duke of Newcastle's difficulties and said, "he was afraid of his own shadow!" which is very true....My Lord intends writing himself to Joe by the German office to-morrow, which will be much better than if I did it. His present idea is that the General should confine his correspondence with the Duke to a copy, or extract, of his private despatch to Lord Holderness....My Lord says that he has had no circulations from Lord Holderness's office since he came to town. Is such treatment from such a *reptile* to be endured?

[1] This step, which the D. of N. was afraid of taking, was judged by General Yorke to be of no utility and was apparently dropped. For further correspondence, N. 214, ff. 333–380.

Right Hon. William Pitt to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[H. 10, f. 8. Copy.] *Decr 11th*, 1759.

SIR,

I beg leave to return you many sincere thanks for the honour of a very obliging letter, wherein your goodness gives a value which no way belongs to anything I can do in obedience to Lord Hardwicke's commands, and on your subject. Not to return to an incident, which has unfortunately given so much pain, I will only trouble you so far as to acquaint you, which I do with sensible satisfaction, that the Duke of Newcastle has assured me that nothing ever so remotely relative to the subject of peace shall, for the future, be kept from my immediate knowledge. I esteem myself particularly happy that in showing the respect I shall ever owe to Lord Hardwicke, I have been able in the least to contribute to his Lordship's ease and satisfaction of mind, as well as to testify the perfect esteem and consideration with which I have the honour to remain,

Dear Sir,

Your most obedient and most humble Servant,

W. PITT.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 10, f. 1.] HAGUE, *Jan. 1st*, 1760.

[He expresses his gratitude to his Father and brothers for the help and support they have given him on the occasion of this unjust attack. No minister has ever been worse treated by his chief than he has.]...Mr Pitt's conduct is studied, and seems to me calculated to create a dependance upon him in return for the service he does, or the indulgence he shows, upon points which his art and eloquence work up into important ones. Nothing piqued me more than to see the Duke of Newcastle affecting to believe he seriously laid a stress upon that trifling affair which raised the storm, and your Lordship very strongly took him up for it. I am the more convinced of his art in this affair from the answer he made to the letter I wrote him, a copy of which I inclose; because, whilst he gravely, tho' civilly, would have me imagine that he had been afraid of a private correspondence about peace with the D. of N., he has been making compliments to your Lordship upon my writing to him, and has shook Charles hard by the hand to thank him for conveying the letter. He means, I suppose, to govern the D. of N. by making us believe we have the greatest obligations to him. I may be out in my conjecture, but this appears to me to be the truth; for his letter is rather too guarded for one who has said so

much to all of you about Lord Holderness, and who has no kind of right to suppose I would betray my country any more than he would. He seems to me, by the turn of his letter, to leave the door open to attack my correspondence with the D. of N. again upon the first occasion he shall find it convenient for his own interest.

Lady Yarmouth did not surprise me. It is the part of a woman and a foreigner, to whom all persons are indifferent, provided she can carry a point. If my Principal has ingratiated himself in the palace of the Rising Sun, as the world says, I can easily conceive her tenderness in managing any channel and securing any creature, who can help to recommend her to any sway, protection and favour *hereafter*, which her present situation and the complexion of the times prevent her from cultivating openly in person. You will see easily that the favour I allude to does not relate to England.

The share our Royal and worthy Master has taken in this transaction is open and worthy of a just and generous Prince, ready to support honest men, when he thinks them to be such; and was he as young as I wish him, I believe he would still have gone further; but age and vexations make a man callous, and therefore I did not expect so much as has appeared in that quarter. Besides, the craft of cunning courtiers gives them a hold, which those who approach the Person only to pay or to do their duty, can never acquire. I shall, however, always remember, to the honour of my Sovereign, that the intelligence I have sometimes sent, which bore hard upon his electoral ministers, never diminish'd his goodness to me, whilst those I have respectfully served have sought my undoing.

Under such circumstances as I am in, I will do my best to continue my correspondence with the D. of N., so as to give no handle against me....

The reprimand suggested to be given by the King will be of no service, in my humble opinion; for as long as he [Holderness] finds there is no determined resolution of getting rid of him, and that he has a hold not easily to be broke, he will only become more difficult, and employ his whole art of intrigue to undermine those who are in his way.... The Prussian ministers informed Mr de Hellen of the whole affair...and sent him orders to tell me, in the name of their Master, that His Prussian Majesty had too great a regard and esteem for me to wish to exclude me from such secrets; that their ministers in England had gone too far, and they could not conceive what they meant or had been about....I was not a little surprised at this compliment which I was, however, so far pleased with, as it served to show the intended blow proceeded only from one narrow mind....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle (in answer to a pressing demand of the latter (H. 71, f. 165) *to use his influence with the Duke of Argyll, to prevent a breach of the latter with the administration, on account of the nomination of Lord Eglinton, a friend of Lord Bute, to the governorship of Dumbarton Castle).*

[N. 217, f. 478.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Feb. 29th*, 1760.

MY DEAR LORD,

The letter, with which your Grace honoured me last night, arrived very late, for which I was sorry, because it hindered my sleeping. You know how desirous I am always to obey your commands. In that case nothing can possibly be so uneasy to one as to receive a command, which it is plain beforehand cannot be executed with effect. I speak for myself, for I know certainly that I have no kind of influence with the Duke of Argyll; and if he is absolutely set upon this thing, should as soon hope to convert the Grand Signor from a Musselman to a Christian by taking a journey to Constantinople, as to move his Grace from his purpose by discourse. It is my opinion that you had better have employed my Lord Mansfield with him, for I am sure he would have more weight. However, I don't say this to decline your Grace's commands. If he calls upon me, I will certainly see him, and say everything that occurs to me[1].

[The Duke of Newcastle had written: "I have another great difficulty upon me, and indeed upon us all. The reversal of so many decrees of my Lord Keeper's, the probability that some more may soon meet with the same fate, the great discredit arising from thence, and the almost total loss of business in the Court of Chancery, makes this, in the opinion of everybody, a most improper time to make his Lordship a peer, and yet what can we do[2]?"] As to my Lord Keeper's peerage, I see no reason arising from *these reversals* to stop it. According to my memory, on the two first appeals from my Lord King's decrees, they were both reversed, yet he was continued in for eight years afterwards. Besides, these two causes were causes of great difficulty, and in some parts reasonably admitted of different opinion. You must either make him a peer or remove him. There is no medium....If your Grace was secure of having a Chancellor more to your mind, there would

[1] His representations were successful (N. 218, ff. 96, 151).

[2] Sir Robert Henley. His position as a Commoner and Speaker of the House of Lords, where he could not open his lips, was an awkward one.

be some reason in it, but I do not see the least probability of it. The Attorney-General [Sir Charles Pratt] will be the man pressed, and there will be a new embarrass and a new breach....

Lord Keeper Henley to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 248, f. 100.] *March 4th*, 1760.

[Expresses his gratitude to Lord Hardwicke, to whom "he owed his first protection in the profession," for his cordiality in promoting his advancement to the peerage*.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 219, f. 36.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *March 26th*, 1760.

MY DEAR LORD,

...Inclosed your Grace will receive your material letters. By an extraordinary fit of expedition, which I have not met with these five months, the letters received by Wednesday's Dutch mail were sent me last night from the office [Lord Holderness]. I much like your answer to Joe; but what can he do if he receives no orders, or what are equal to none, from the Secretary of State of the Province? Your Grace gives him, it is true, very good hints; but if he cannot avow them, he can make no use of them to justify himself in doing or saying anything, not prescribed from the office in the King's name. My Lord Holderness will be always upon the catch, and Mr Pitt may either strongly approve, or as strongly condemn, according to the prevailing humour. The truth is that his Majesty ought either to have another Secretary of State in the Northern Department, or another Minister in Holland....

Earl of Hardwicke to Robert Dundas, Lord President of the Court of Session

[G. W. Omond, *Arniston Mem.* 163.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June 12th*, 1760.

MY DEAR LORD,...

I am very glad that the rejecting of the Scotch Militia Bill is not disagreeable to many of the best friends of the government. They judge very rightly, for I am thoroughly persuaded

* To my Father on being made a peer; acknowledges his good offices and protection; —paid to his memory the debt of *gratitude* in the H. of Lords, when his Lordship reflected on his getting reversions, and acknowledged to his family, when he insisted on Floyd's sons being neuter in the election of High Steward of Cambridge University. H. [Below, pp. 484–5, and 374.]

that the passing of it would have been advantageous only to its enemies. I know your Lordship has so much spirit, and so manly a way of thinking, as to despise the ill-placed abuse, which the favourers of that scheme may throw out against you. You may safely wait for *the echo*....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle in answer to a letter from the Duke, of August 16 (H. 71, f. 250), *asking for advice and direction.*

[N. 225, f. 168.] WIMPOLE, *August 20th*, 1760.

...I shall take up the several points....[5th. The Speaker, Mr Onslow, should certainly be encouraged to keep the Chair for another year. He sometimes took up "patriotic notions" and "bounced in the Chair," but these manifestations did no real harm and he had honourably, throughout his tenure of office, kept himself free from court factions, which a successor might not do. He would speak to the King in his support, if that should be thought of any use.

6th. As to the choice of the new Parliament, and whether this should be concerted with Mr Pitt (who, as the Duke of Newcastle had said, wished to bring in Tories), his co-operation should be secured, but in a general way, without giving up to him the control of the elections, but at the same time taking care of his friends.

7th. As to the continuance of the militia, unless this should be a perpetual continuance which must be withstood, anything was better than a disruption of the administration at this time of crisis.]

8th. ...As to the state of the administration, I think I never saw it better. You have no personal points depending, like those of the last autumn, threatening a breach continually. The ill-humour of the Closet is a subject which your Grace and I have frequently talked and writ upon; and I allow it to have all the disagreeableness, mortification and vexation, whilst in the operation, that is possible. But I confess I cannot lay quite so much stress upon it, as your Grace appears to do, nor does Mr Pitt to the degree in which he talks it up[1]. If other things go right, he won't quit for that. I am no advocate for peevishness or ill-humour, but some allowances must be made for the infirmities of great old age. A Prince, naturally vivacious and passionate brusque and emporté when young, will of course increase in those qualities as he grows

[1] Pitt had just made violent complaints of the King's conduct towards him.

older....I am persuaded that there is much truth in my Lady Yarmouth's way of accounting for this ill-humour, the long delay of the mails and news from the army. We are so made that ill-humour arising upon one point operates upon all. Your Grace observes truly how different this is from his manner of receiving and treating you, upon the late melancholy event in your family[1]. That passed when he was calm and softened by tender circumstances, and I look upon it as his real disposition and way of thinking, and he would do the same again. The other is a fit, or a storm. Mr Pitt has to me sometimes allowed this, and he would not have appeared to lay so much weight upon the behaviour to himself, had it not been for the refusal of his governor of Guadeloupe. I see he is a Scotchman, and I don't like the Scotch having the government of most of our Plantations. But, to be sure, it is strange to refuse the recommendation of the Secretary of State of the Province, and upon whom the present weight of the American department so greatly lies. [He is convinced that the suspicion that the surrender of Cassel took place by the order of the King, or his German minister, is entirely baseless.]...As to Lord H[olderness], his Lordship is incomprehensible to me. He has either the best luck in the world, or has better abilities than most people have been disposed to allow him. For ought I can see, he has gained security, both with the King and his fellow ministers, by those very methods, for which they have the greatest reason to be offended with him. I cannot help suspecting that he makes a merit with the former by being in some instances (to use a coarse expression) a double spy. How long this will last, I can't tell, but I must be permitted to admire your singular Christian patience....

Major-Gen. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 10, f. 110.] HAGUE, *Oct. 6th*, 1760.

...Nothing gave me so much pleasure as the account you are pleased to give me of the interior, particularly that the Duke of Newcastle and Mr Pitt are upon such good terms*. Your Lordship is the only person who does not declare that that harmony is owing to yourself. As to Savile House, nobody understands it, nor will, I believe, during His Majesty's life (which God long preserve). In general, all the English who come this way in

[1] The Countess of Lincoln, the Duke's niece, had died July 27.

* It is [a] pity, for the sake of the public, that the harmony between these two great men was not always so great as it then seemed to be. H. (H. 75, f. 211.)

great numbers, are displeased with the conduct there, and complain of the reserve, though they do justice to the private character of the Prince, which they represent as mild and affable when he can be got at....

[On October 19, 1760 (N. 228, f. 201; H. 72, f. 96; N. 228, f. 207), Lord Hardwicke sends the Duke of Newcastle from Wimpole a long letter on the subject of the finances and the new taxation necessary to meet the enormous supply, of between 16 and 17 millions, for the coming year. In another letter of the same date he discusses the militia, and advises that the question of its continuation and permanence should be deferred till the new Parliament had assembled, and till the war had been concluded. He has the same strong dislike to it as the Duke, but advises the latter "politically" not to carry his objections too far in opposition.]

CHAPTER XXIX

THE GREAT WAR 1757–1760

WE have now arrived at the threshold of those great triumphs which were to be realised at last, after many years of extraordinary national sacrifices and of individual energy and prowess, beyond the dreams of the most ardent ambition. The changed political situation offered for the first time sure hopes of success, and of results commensurate with the enormous expenditure of blood and treasure. The heir to the throne and his party, supporting the ministers, no longer obstructed their measures or led cabals. All opposition ceased in Parliament and the administration was given a free hand in its management of affairs abroad and of the war. Shortly after the inauguration of the new government, the King's Hanoverian partialities, in consequence of the Convention of Closterseven, ceased to operate, and impeded no more the British ministers in their foreign policy and military plans, over which they now, for the first time, had full control. At the same time the Duke of Cumberland's influence in military matters, and in the choice of commanders, which had long had mischievous results, terminated[1], and the cabinet, who were responsible to Parliament and the nation for the conduct of the war, advised by the veteran Lord Ligonier, as Commander-in-Chief, had in their own hands the military appointments. A number of young officers of merit and ability, such as Wolfe, Amherst and Coote, to whom so large a share of the great victories which followed was due, too long neglected and employed in subordinate or routine duties, were now

[1] See above, p. 1. Gen. Yorke writing to his Father says he "had seen many inconveniences from the power and influence he had acquired." H. 10, f. 110. Yet Wolfe writes generously, and with loyalty to his old master, "The Duke's resignation may be reckoned an addition to our misfortunes; he acted a right part, but the country will suffer by it." R. Wright, *Life of Wolfe*, 398. But he was probably not acquainted with the inner history of affairs.

brought forward and trusted with independent commands[1]. "The employing officers of a different stamp," writes Lord Royston to Dr Birch, on September 15, 1759, "from those we unluckily set out with, has caused this great alteration in our affairs[2]." The navy, without which none of the great victories and conquests of these years could have been gained, at last began to show the full results of the wise and careful administration of Lord Anson[3], who, fortunately for the nation, was once more placed by Lord Hardwicke's influence at the head of the Admiralty[4], and who promoted and gave commands to many new officers of ability, such as Boscawen, Saunders, Hardy, Rodney, Howe, Keppel and Jervis[5]. The firm maintenance of good order and government during a long course of years had increased greatly the material prosperity of the country; while the able management of the public finances, and the reduction and conversion of the national debt, raised and strengthened the national credit, and rendered the burden of the enormous national expenditure possible and tolerable. The unsatisfactory and indecisive close of the last struggle with France had been largely occasioned by the necessity of withdrawing the whole of the British forces in the Netherlands for service in Scotland. England now for the first time entered upon a great war joined to Scotland in a real union, and with the Highlanders fighting in considerable bodies in her cause. Last, but not least, Pitt's influence and eloquence in the House of Commons were for the first time employed steadily in support of the measures of the administration, instead of in opposition and obstruction, and his great talents given their full scope in

[1] See J. Yorke's testimony, whose friends these were, and who had often urged their merits: see below, pp. 198, 237–8. Wolfe had written to his father of Amherst in 1756, "Nobody deserves the King's favour better than that man." *Life*, by R. Wright, 334. See also p. 104, Wolfe to his father, April 12, 1748, where he relates a conversation with J. Yorke, "then Adjutant-General," in which the latter speaks of Wolfe's useful services and assures him of the D. of C.'s intention to promote him. Wolfe was gazetted Major of the 20th Foot in Jan. 1749, Lieut.-Col. 1750, but passed over for the command of the regiment in 1755 and given rank of Colonel in Oct. 1757 only on his return from the expedition to Rochefort, through the recommendation of Hawke and Anson. *Ib.* 113, 145, 314, 394.

[2] H. 51, f. 98; H. 69, f. 41.

[3] See Lord Sandwich on being appointed head of the Admiralty to Anson, March 19, 1748, "I beg of you to consider my being there singly as an addition to your power.... I intend to depend entirely upon your Lordship, and to throw the direction of the whole as much as possible into your hands." Add. MSS. 15957, f. 53.

[4] p. 159, and see vol. ii. 352, 370.

[5] Barrow's *Anson*, 320, 350.

directing the course of the war[1]. "I know nobody," wrote the Duke of Newcastle, "who can plan or push the execution of any plan agreed upon in the manner Mr Pitt did." How greatly these favourable circumstances were the result of Lord Hardwicke's counsels and influence has been shown in preceding chapters. He had known how to subordinate minor considerations to the great object in view, and had himself made both political and personal sacrifices. Still more, he had succeeded in impressing upon the Duke of Newcastle and Pitt, and also upon the King, the necessity for compromise, and of thorough union at this moment of national crisis.

While therefore there was no change in the policy of the government or in its military or naval plans, a great increase of vigour and activity was seen in their execution[2]; and Great Britain, possessing only a population of eight or nine millions, could venture upon a struggle with France which counted 20 millions of inhabitants, which possessed territory in Europe almost as extensive as at the present time, and kept on foot armies numbering more than 270,000 men.

It was some time, however, before the full results and advantages of the changed political situation were realised. The new administration, as we have seen, had been constituted only just in time to avert the triumph of the French arms and final disaster on the Continent; and the King of Prussia's victory at Prague, on May 6, 1757, had been followed by his defeat at Kolin on June 18, and by the advance of the Russians and Swedes into his territories. By the second treaty of Versailles, on May 1, 1756[3], with France,

[1] There is no foundation for the silly legends circulated by Almon in his *Anecdotes of the Life of Chatham*, that Pitt sent his orders direct to the executive officers, and that the rest of the ministers merely acquiesced in his decisions. See Pitt's own disclaimer, Walpole, *George III*, i. 92.

[2] Cf. Walpole, who is always superficial, *Letters*, iv. 222, November 1758, "If Mr Pitt had not exerted the spirit and activity that he has, we should ere now have been past a critical situation. Such a war as ours, carried on by my Lord Hardwicke, with the dull dilatoriness of a Chancery suit, would long ago have reduced us to what suits in Chancery reduce most people"; and cf. J. S. Corbett, Lecturer in Hist. to the Royal Naval War College (*England in the Seven Years' War*, 1907, i. 87), "The great lawyer's grasp and modernity in strategical thought is remarkable"; and further below, pp. 247, 334; and Pitt in the House of Commons in 1761, "he had borrowed their majority to carry on their own plan." Walpole, *George III*, i. 83.

[3] Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 325, who quotes part of an extraordinary letter from Kaunitz, the Austrian minister, to Mme de Pompadour, of June 14, 1757, assuring her of the Emperor and Empress's gratitude for her goodwill in effusive terms, increased, it is declared, if possible, "par la considération qu'elles ne le doivent qu'à votre inviolable attachement pour la personne sacrée de ce prince respectable."

and the treaty of St Petersburg, on January 21, 1757, with Russia, Maria Theresa had secured two powerful allies; and a general concerted attack was projected by the three Powers against Frederick, whose status was to be reduced to that of a Count of Brandenburg.

Very little had been done since the fall of the Newcastle government in November 1756. "The business of the nation," wrote Lord Barrington, the Secretary at War, "seems perfectly at a stand[1]." Small squadrons were despatched to various quarters, but the Mediterranean was quite neglected, and proposals were made by Pitt for ceding Gibraltar to Spain. A negotiation for peace, begun by Joseph Yorke at the Hague in March 1757, with d'Affry, the French ambassador, through Slingelandt, the Receiver-General of Holland, was broken off almost immediately after its commencement[2]. The advent of the new administration was at first followed by only new misfortunes.

Lord Loudoun and Admiral Holborne, sent to reduce Louisburg, after long delays and hesitation, agreed upon the impossibility of doing anything without reinforcements, and subsequently, in September, the latter's fleet was almost destroyed by a terrific storm before this place[3]. Fort William Henry on Lake St George capitulated to Montcalm on August 9. On July 19, Ostend and Nieuport received French garrisons, and the French appeared to have secured the chief object for which they had entered into alliance with Austria[4]. The ill-managed expedition, projected by Pitt against Rochefort, proved a complete failure, and cost nearly half a million. The whole blame for the unfortunate

[1] The D. of N. writes to Mitchell, British envoy in Prussia, on July 16, 1757, "There has been as much business done these last ten days as there was in many months before." N. 187, f. 214. Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 154; Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 167, 172. Add. MSS. 6834, f. 6.

[2] D'Affry's paper had the expression, "His most Christian Majesty was still desirous to bring it [peace] about, but could not without satisfaction was previously given for all the violence and injustice we had been guilty of." "When I had read this extract," Gen. Yorke writes to Holderness, "I gave it back into Mr Slingelandt's hands; and when he asked me with some surprise whether I would not keep it, I told him certainly not, that I had been authorised to receive any propositions from Mons. D'Affry but not impertinences." His conduct obtained full official approval. R. O. Holland, J. Y. to Holderness, March 8, 1757, Holderness to J. Y., March 11; *Hist. MSS. Comm.* Rep. 3, App. 135; *Pol. Corr. Friedrich's*, xiv. 291.

[3] "Lord Loudoun, with 12,000 men, thought himself no match for the French with but 7,000; and Admiral Holborne, with 17 ships of the line, declined attacking the French because they had 18." Chesterfield's *Letters* (Bradshaw), iii. 1178, 1205: Walpole, *Letters*, iv. 92.

[4] J. S. Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War*, i. 18 sqq.

result was cast by the minister on the land officers in command. He declared in Parliament, "that his belief was that there was a determined resolution, both in the naval and military commanders, against any vigorous exertion of the national power." But Sir John Mordaunt, the Commander-in-Chief, was exculpated by the court-martial; and the whole policy of separate, isolated expeditions, of which Pitt remained a firm supporter and promoter during the entire course of the war, was strongly opposed by the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke. They deprecated the waste of troops and resources on such attempts—in Fox's phrase—"using guineas to break windows[1]," at a time when reinforcements were so greatly needed in Germany[2], and when a refusal, indeed, endangered the alliance with the King of Prussia, who in July returned a curt rejection of the subsidies offered by England, and in August was again negotiating with the French[3].

"It is clear," says a recent writer, "that Hardwicke and his friends had quite failed to grasp the fundamental idea of Pitt's strategy, or to understand the value of diversions[4]." This, however,

[1] Chesterfield's *Letters*, 1228.

[2] Below, pp. 157-8, 197-8, 214, 230, and further 252; H. 69, ff. 3, 5; N. 187, ff. 320, 340.

[3] Waddington's *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 375, 378.

[4] J. S. Corbett, i. 228, 302. Quoting from Pajal, *Les Guerres sous Louis XV* (vi. 320), he shows that the expedition occasioned orders for the march of some French troops towards the quarter exposed, and see also Waddington's *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 748, and Gen. J. Y. to Holderness, September 30, 1757 (R. O. St. Pap. Holland) who encloses extracts of letters to show "the measures taken in consequence of it," mentioning the despatch of several battalions and detachments of cavalry. The project also received the enthusiastic support of Wolfe (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* Rep. ix. pt. iii. 77). But this is not enough to justify Pitt's policy. It must be shown that the large body of troops, employed in the expedition, would not have created a more considerable "diversion" in Germany, and one which would have had real influence on the final result of the war. Next year General Yorke asserts the undoubted utility of the expedition to Cherbourg as a "diversion" (H. 9, f. 288) but appears to modify his approval later (H. 9, f. 296), and Mr Corbett in estimating the value of this expedition allows (i. 302) "that Ferdinand was disappointed that they did not seem to reduce Contades' army to any serious degree"; see again the failure to make a "diversion" by the attempts on the French coast in 1761 (ii. 176) and see below, p. 267. It is true that Frederick encouraged Pitt's "diversions" in this quarter, but the force of this argument in their favour, which would otherwise have been considerable, is entirely destroyed by the fact that he did so only as a *pis aller*, and after the despatch of troops to Germany had been absolutely refused "à cause d'un vertigo que Pitt s'est mis dans sa tête." Corbett, i. 263; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 375-380, "Je crois que votre Monsieur Pitt est devenu fou," etc.; below, p. 131. Mitchell to Holderness, February 9, 1758, S. P. Prussia, J. Y. to Holderness, April 11, 1758, *ib.* "He [F.] mentioned his wishes that, since it was not thought advisable to send our troops upon the Continent, we would at least adopt, what he termed, le système des démonstrations." H. 9, f. 296. See again F.'s opinion on the expedition to Belleisle which he applauds, but at the same time fears that it will not occasion the Prince de Soubise to make large

is to mistake the point of dispute. Lord Hardwicke and the Duke understood equally with Pitt the importance of "diversions," but they differed from him in thinking that this "fundamental idea" could be realised far more effectively by giving substantial support to the forces maintained by England in Germany, where the military operations were nothing else than a diversion on a large scale, of which the great aim—and indeed the result—was to draw the power of France away from the colonial and maritime war, and to compel her to waste her resources in a barren and fatal continental campaign—in short, to conquer America in Germany[1].

This was, in all probability, the true strategy. Pitt, however, was influenced not alone by military, but also by political considerations, in his determined opposition to the despatch of troops to the Continent, notwithstanding the pressing demands of the King of Prussia. It was only gradually, and by slow stages, that he emancipated himself and his followers from the false principle of non-intervention in Germany. The diatribes against Hanover, which had served their purpose at the time, now came home to roost; and Pitt was embarrassed by his former declamations, and by the false notions with which he had intoxicated his party. "I fear," Lord Hardwicke writes on January 29, 1758, to the Duke of Newcastle, "our new friends have promised the county gentlemen that no such thing shall be; and that may be part of the terms of their agreeing to give the money[2]." Moreover, Pitt was especially anxious at this time to retain the favour of the Princess of Wales and of the young heir to the throne, who did all in their power to prevent any support being given to the Duke of Cumberland, and later to Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, both of whom were the objects of great jealousy at Leicester House[3]. Unscrupulous intrigues there were chiefly responsible for the disastrous expedition to St Malo and Cherbourg in 1758, as well as for the refusal to send troops to Germany[4]; and it was not till June 1758, after Prince Ferdinand's victory of Creveld, that Lord Bute could approve of the despatch of reinforcements, mainly for the reason that the British troops were now placed under the inspiring

detachments. *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xx. 495–6. And the whole policy was disapproved by Anson (H. 28, f. 150), though he appears to have believed this particular attempt practicable. See p. 189.

[1] pp. 157–9; N. 205, ff. 192–5.

[2] H. 192, f. 275; see also below, p. 152.

[3] *Chatham Corr.* i. 294, 298, 301; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 181 sqq.

[4] N. 199, ff. 260, 289.

leadership of Lord George Sackville, the military commander, in whom the greatest confidence was placed by the Prince of Wales and his advisers and who, it was hoped, would soon supersede Prince Ferdinand as the General of the combined forces abroad, and become later at home a subservient Commander-in-Chief in the new reign[1].

The actual results, however, of military measures when complicated, as was now the case, by political and secret considerations, can be calculated with very little accuracy or certainty; and it is very probable, had the troops been despatched instead to reinforce the Duke of Cumberland, that they would have been employed, in the actual circumstances, to no better purpose. After many weeks of inaction, the Duke with his force, styled with ominous significance "the army of observation," upon the approach of the French in superior numbers, began immediately a retreat, which developed into panic and confusion, and which was only saved from becoming a great catastrophe by the inactivity and bad generalship of the enemy[2]. On June 14 he had retired behind the Weser; and on July 26 he was attacked at Hastenbeck, when the day was only lost by his hasty retreat, once more resumed and not arrested till the army had reached Stade, at the mouth of the Elbe, whence he hoped to keep open his communications with England. The whole of Hanover as well as Brunswick was then occupied by the enemy, and the way was left open through Hesse-Cassel for an attack upon the King of Prussia, who at this moment found himself in a situation regarded as almost desperate, even by his staunchest friends[3].

This great disaster came as a shock and a surprise to those that had no inkling of what was passing behind the scenes. To Colonel Yorke at the Hague the spiritless retreat after a loss of only 600 men to Stade[4], where the army could be of no further service, and the hurried surrender, when if the Duke had waited a few weeks longer he would have been relieved, and enabled to join hands with Frederick after the latter's victory at Rosbach, were incidents both fatal and inexplicable[5]. But to the Hanoverian ministers these

[1] See below, p. 139; *Chatham Corr.* i. 320, 325.

[2] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xv. 191 *n.*; below, pp. 160 sqq.

[3] Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 380 sqq.

[4] Amherst's account of the retreat to J. Y. September 1, 1757, R. O. Holland.

[5] pp. 167, 169; see also the letter from Gen. Zastrow of October 7 giving his opinion that there was no reason for the Duke's retreat to Stade, and further, that he could have maintained his army there all the winter. H. 69, f. 101.

were acceptable and welcome events, previously arranged and prepared for[1]. Indeed, according to the Duke of Cumberland himself, the retreat to Stade was part of the orders given to him by the King on his departure and confirmed later[2], and a general fighting under these conditions is not likely to gain any brilliant victories.

The cause of the catastrophe was the fatal influence, which now for the last time blighted and ruined the plans of the British government. While the King of England was engaged in a desperate struggle with the hereditary enemy and in support of the King of Prussia, the Elector of Hanover was negotiating treaties with France and Austria for a peace. While considerable sums according to Lord Hardwicke's computation about £800,000[3], were obtained from the British Parliament for the prosecution of the war upon the Continent and for the maintenance of the Hessian troops, with the principal objects of defending Hanover as a vantage ground whence to direct hostilities against France, and at the same time of preventing any attack upon Prussia from that quarter, the Elector and his Hanoverian ministers[4] were, without the authority of the British cabinet, arranging a neutrality with Austria, which exempted Hanover from any participation in the war[5], and which allowed the Duc de Richelieu to detach a portion of his forces to the support of the Prince de Soubise, against whom Frederick at that moment was advancing[6]. The alliance with Prussia itself and the whole foreign plan were endangered[7]. Nor was the security of Hanover in the least assured by its desertion of the common cause. Writing on March 29, 1757, to his brother, Lord Royston, Col. Yorke had severely criticised the project of Hanoverian neutrality, then already talked of and believed to be impending. "This neutral conduct I look upon as of all others the most dangerous, because you gain no friend by it and certainly increase your enemies[8]." Hanover, at last, distrusted on all sides,

[1] H. 9, f. 201; *Mém. de Bernis*, i. 399.

[2] H. 69, f. 77, extract of a letter from the Duke to the King, September 24, 1757, in Lord H.'s handwriting, in which the Duke defends himself on the plea of the King's instructions. Lord H. appends the query "Were there any in writing?"

[3] p. 183.

[4] According to Walpole (*George II*, ii. 376) they were "Austrian in their hearts with the additional encumbrance of possessing estates in the countries of the Empress."

[5] Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 174–196.

[6] p. 178.

[7] H. 9, f. 207.

[8] H. 16, f. 200; below, p. 159.

was left to make her own terms and, as the Duke of Cumberland complained, to resist alone the might of France. Frederick of Prussia did not send the promised auxiliaries. The British cabinet, aware of negotiations, but ignorant of their exact nature, remained inactive, and now affected an irresponsibility regarding Hanoverian affairs, while Pitt's refusal to send troops to the Continent, to rectify the Duke's inferiority of forces, was justified.

At this crisis, however, all rallied once more round the old King in his distress and endeavoured to support his firmness and resolution, diminished by advancing years. Lady Yarmouth urged that a separate peace would leave a stain upon his memory[1]. Lord Hardwicke authorised the Duke of Newcastle to tell the King in his name, in respectful terms, that such a step could not possibly secure the safety of Hanover, and could only end in tarnishing the King's honour at the close of a reign never yet sullied[2]. Pitt proposed an immediate offer of money to the King of Prussia, who now began negotiations with France[3], to prevent his concluding peace, and was prepared next year to give £1,200,000 for the continental war. Lord Hardwicke, while concurring and advising a full disclosure of the state of affairs to the King of Prussia, deprecated any delay, and pointed out that the cabinet could only oppose the fatal intentions of the King by offering a sum of money equal to the exigencies of the crisis: to which Pitt agreed at once, undertaking to satisfy his followers and to convince them of the necessity of quitting "the rigidity of their declarations[4]."

But the old King's mind was possessed by one idea alone, the impending danger to his beloved Electorate and people. He gave his son, unknown to, but not entirely unsuspected by, the English ministers, full powers to treat, as speedily as possible, for a peace or neutrality or even for a preliminary arrangement, with instructions to secure the relief of the country and the preservation of the army[5], and he informed the King of Prussia of his intentions and of his desperate situation[6].

[1] p. 174. [2] p. 175.

[3] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xv. 300; *Mém. de Bernis*, i. 400 sqq.; *Grenville Papers*, i. 206.

[4] pp. 161–3, 166. Thomas Potter, one of Pitt's satellites, in a letter undated, but probably belonging to this period, promises to smooth matters with the party, but is looking forward to having "to sustain some jokes upon our change of principles." Chatham MSS. 53; see also Walpole, *George II*, iii. 179.

[5] Waddington, i. 485 sqq.; and see below, p. 168, and vol. ii. 387.

[6] Waddington, i. 493 sqq. Frederick replied, "Je ne me persuaderai jamais que

Neither the King, however, nor the Hanoverian ministers were prepared for the unfavourable terms agreed to in the Convention of Closterseven, on September 8, by the Duke, whose only anxiety appears to have been, as Lord Royston observes, "to get his neck out of the collar." This treaty, arranged under the suspected intervention of Denmark, left the whole of the electoral dominions at the mercy of the French, dispersed the Duke's forces and failed to secure any of those Hanoverian advantages which the King had hoped to gain by his desertion of the great cause[1]; and it was followed, on September 20, by a treaty between the Duke of Brunswick and France, by which the territory and army of Brunswick were surrendered to the enemy[2].

The Duke of Cumberland returned home blamed and repudiated by his father, who received him with the words, "Here is my son who has ruined me and disgraced himself[3]." He immediately resigned all his military appointments. He fell into confirmed ill-health and became unfit for any active employment; and in August 1760, a stroke affected permanently his speech[4].

parce qu'un allié est malheureux, ce soit une raison de l'abandonner....J'attends dans le silence, et sans émotion, le dénouement de cet évènement." *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xv. 317.

[1] See pp. 160 sqq., 178 sqq.; Walpole's *Letters*, iv. 95; Waddington, i. 458–495.

[2] Waddington, i. 516, 521, 652. [3] p. 188.

[4] pp. 180–8; Walpole's *Letters*, iv. 419, 426; Chesterfield's *Letters* (Bradshaw), iii. 1182. Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 501–3. This author's severe remarks upon the King's "duplicity" do not seem, any more than those of Walpole, who has completely misunderstood the situation (*George II* (1847), iii. 57 sqq.), and who accuses him of the "treacherous sacrifice" of his son (*Reminiscences*, *British Prose Writers*, xxiv. 65), to be deserved. He had, it is true, given the Duke "full powers," and this fact was acknowledged by the King himself (see the correction in his handwriting in Lord Holderness's letter to the Duke of September 20); but he had also given definite instructions that the army was to be preserved and Hanover relieved of the enemy, neither of which conditions had been secured. According to the D. of Cumberland's defenders and apologists, the Convention, with the exact terms, had been concluded by the King's express orders, and the Duke only withheld these instructions to save the King's honour and to avoid compromising him with the K. of Prussia; see Abreu, the Spanish Ambassador in London, to Grimaldi, October 18 quoted by Waddington, i. 514. Of this there is no evidence whatever, and Lord Hardwicke declares it to be a "downright falsity." pp. 189–190, 194. The King's statement to Pitt, that he had given his son no orders for this treaty, was quite true and accurate, and Pitt's reply, "But full powers, Sir, very full powers," has not the force or point commonly ascribed to it. pp. 193–4; Walpole, *George II*, iii. 60. A. W. Ward, *Great Britain and Hanover*, 191 sqq.; N. 188, ff. 1–10, 111; N. 189, ff. 163, 195 to 201. Mr Waddington also writes (i. 500) "A l'égard du Duc de Cumberland, qui n'avait jamais été des amis de Newcastle et encore moins de Pitt, les ministres anglais ne demandaient pas mieux d'attiser le feu et de faire porter au Prince toute la responsabilité de la convention scandaleuse." He here follows Walpole, *George II*, iii. 59–60. The exact contrary is

In these circumstances, so disastrous and so completely beyond their control, the ministers were in despair. The King of Prussia declared his intention of dying by his own hand, in case of further defeat, and began a negotiation with Richelieu, the Commander of the French forces[1]. "Let us try to get out of this detestable, ruinous war," wrote Lord Hardwicke, "as fast as we can." "Old England was being risked for New England[2]." "We are undone both at home and abroad," cried Lord Chesterfield; "at home, by our increasing debt and expenses, abroad by our ill-luck and incapacity....The French are masters to do what they please in America. We are no longer a nation; I never yet saw so dreadful a prospect[3]." Pitt declared himself to have "sunk into little less than despair of the public[4]." Writing to Sir Benjamin Keene, the British ambassador at Madrid, on August 23, he described the "empire...[as] no more, the ports of the Netherlands betrayed, the Dutch barrier treaty an empty sound, Minorca and with it the Mediterranean lost, and America itself precarious[5]." Pitt even turned for aid to Spain, offering in vain as an inducement to an alliance the abandonment of the British establishments in Honduras and the Mosquito Shore, and the cession of Gibraltar in return for the support of Spain in recovering Minorca[6].

A serious proposal was also set on foot to gain over Mme de Pompadour. The Duke of Newcastle followed up his former presents by sending her a box of pineapples and later, even a telescope[7]. Lord Hardwicke only advised that the *douceur* should be a large one, and that "the temptation should be as strong as possible[8]."

Abroad, the British ministers and agents concerned themselves

the truth. The Duke was treated with the greatest generosity by all three ministers, who did their utmost to mitigate the King's resentment, below, pp. 181, 183, 189, 191, 193–4.

[1] Waddington, 586 sqq. [2] H. 3, f. 387.

[3] *Letters* (Bradshaw), 1170; H. 69, f. 113.

[4] To Lord G. Sackville, October 15, 1757. *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Mrs Stopford-Sackville, i. 51.

[5] *Chatham Corr.* i. 251.

[6] p. 165; *Hist. MSS. Comm. Rep.* x. (1) 212, 218; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 141; Waddington, i. 483. See *Chatham MSS.* 92 for the minutes of the Council, August 18, 1757—Granville, Newcastle, Hardwicke, Anson and Pitt present. Even Col. J. Y. acquiesced, provided some considerable advantage were gained (H. 9, f. 125). Lord H., however, writing to the D. of N. on August 11, expressed great doubts of the wisdom of the proposal, especially regarding the relative importance of Minorca; see below, p. 168.

[7] Waddington, *Louis XV et le Renversement des Alliances*, 57–8, 74.

[8] N. 189, f. 262.

in endeavouring to reassure the several foreign states as to the fidelity and firmness of the ministers at home. They repudiated on their behalf any share in the Convention, circulated a memorandum in that sense, forwarded by the cabinet, and explained the difference between the King of England and the Elector of Hanover. Col. Joseph Yorke at the Hague describes himself as completely overwhelmed with the dishonour cast upon the British cause, and refrains from repeating the bitter reproaches which poured in from friend and foe alike[1]. At the same time, he was far from feeling the intense despair which oppressed the government at home.

He still placed his full confidence in the abilities and energy of his hero, the King of Prussia, which events proved to be fully justified. On October 16, the latter wrote to the King urging him to repudiate the Convention and to join hands with him from Hanover[2]. Advancing against the French, to whom the Convention had exposed him, Frederick, with considerably less than half the troops of the enemy, won the great battle of Rosbach, on November 5, 1757, and saved the situation, both for himself and for England. Then rushing with extraordinary celerity to the other side of his dominions, he gained another victory at Leuthen, with greatly inferior numbers, over the Austrians, on December 5. Moreover, the Russians, who had gained a victory over the Prussian troops at Gross Jägersdorf, on August 30, began a retreat almost immediately afterwards to their own country, without attempting anything further.

These successes greatly strengthened the hands of the British ministers and the horizon gradually cleared. The repudiation of the Convention of Closterseven, for which a pretext had been given by the attempted disarming by the French of the Hessian troops[3], followed close upon the victory of Rosbach, on November 28[4]. It met now with no opposition from the King, and with the Convention disappeared from the scene the last vestige of the separate and fatal Hanoverian policy, the interests of which country were now united with those of Great Britain[5]. The Duke of Cumberland's office of Commander-in-Chief was filled by the

[1] pp. 177–8, 183. [2] N. 190, f. 137.

[3] Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, i. 507 sqq., 514, 647 sqq.

[4] pp. 173, 180 sqq.; H. 69, f. 181; N. 189, ff. 475–7.

[5] The renewal of the negotiations for neutrality through the mediation of Denmark in 1758 met with an immediate rejection from the King. Waddington, ii. 202; N. 195, ff. 96, 114.

appointment of the experienced veteran, Sir John Ligonier, a measure opposed by the King, whose paternal partiality desired to keep it open for the Duke's return, but strongly urged by Lord Hardwicke, who especially insisted on the handing over of the choice of officers to the new head of the army[1]. Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick succeeded the Duke in command of the troops abroad, and the English ministers undertook to maintain them, provided they were set in motion against the French once more[2]. Meanwhile, on June 23, 1757, the great victory of Plassey had been won by Clive in India, which finally established British rule in Bengal[3].

In December, on the opening of Parliament, a great speech was made by Pitt, eulogising the King, congratulating the country on the concert between the ministers, extolling the triumphant Clive in India—"that man not born for a desk, that Heaven-born General"—and reflecting upon the unfortunate Loudoun in America, who had "loitered from the 9th of July to the 5th of August, inquiring whether or no the French were superior," and whose failure, he declared, "had hurt his (Pitt's) quiet and tainted his health[4]." The financial condition of the country showed as yet little injury from the immense burden of the war. The victory of the King of Prussia, wrote the Duke of Newcastle to Col. Yorke, was making the continent "a favourite in England."

The Duke was able to borrow at 3 per cent., and pay no more than a price equivalent to the present value of government stock. There was no lack of money and no unwillingness to give it. "Who could ever have imagined that a succour in money of two million sterling would be given without one single negative in the House of Commons, and that is the case[5]." Lord Barrington, the Secretary at War, writes to Mitchell, the British minister at Berlin, to the same effect, and adds, "The Duke of Newcastle, Lord President [Granville], Lord Hardwicke, Lord Mansfield, the two Secretaries of State [Pitt and Holderness] and Lord Anson, form what Lord Granville calls the *conciliabulum*. They meet continually, and

[1] pp. 190 sqq.

[2] Waddington, i. 517.

[3] See Clive's Corr. with Lord H., pp. 169, 195, 232. One of the ships of the East India Company was named the "Hardwicke." Gleig's *Life of Clive* (1907), 115.

[4] Walpole, *George II*, iii. 89.

[5] N. 191, f. 53; N. 192, f. 290, and H. 3, f. 432.

their opinion is the advice given to the King. They always mean to agree and if they differ, they differ amicably. I am convinced at present there is not a man among them who wishes ill to the others[1]."

A new start was made with new hopes, in much more favourable circumstances, in the new year 1758. The French fleets were prevented from sailing to America by the operations of Hawke and Osborne. Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick drove the French from Hanover, and pursuing them across the Rhine, gained a substantial victory over them at Creveld on June 23. Pitt had refused again to send troops to Germany[2], and wasted once more the national resources on further expeditions to the French coast. St Malo and Cherbourg were attacked with some small success, but these attempts terminated with a serious disaster and the loss of nearly 1000 men at St Cast on September 11[3], and the reinforcements which were sent to Prince Ferdinand arrived too late to be of any service this year. The French gained a success in Hesse, and the Prince retreated across the Rhine to his winter quarters.

Meanwhile, the attitude of the King of Prussia was causing the ministers some anxiety. It was known that in the autumn of last year, at the time of the unlucky Convention, he had renewed negotiations with France[4]. He now showed great dissatisfaction at Pitt's absolute refusal to support the war in Germany with British troops[5]; and in January, 1758, declined to sign the Convention, in which England offered a subsidy of £670,000 but refused the troops[6]. Pitt, always too prone to throw the blame for any failure or mischance upon others, expressed great anger

[1] Mitchell MSS., Add. 6834, ff. 11, 12 and 21.

[2] N. 192, f. 273; N. 197, ff. 348–50; H. 69, ff. 250–258.

[3] pp. 117, 215; Walpole's *George II*, iii. 123 sqq., 133, 135; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 199; *United Service Mag.*, January 1908; Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, iii. 351, where, according to the French accounts, the loss was much larger. In this expedition James Cocks, Lady Hardwicke's nephew, a promising young man of great military ardour, whose relations, on account of his large fortune, had endeavoured in vain to dissuade from a military career, fell a victim. According to the anonymous writer in R. Cooksey's *Essays*, whose statements concerning Lord Hardwicke's life and character, and work in equity, have found so much credence, the expedition was entirely the work of Lord Hardwicke, with the one object of "getting rid of this ill-fated young man," and of enjoying his estate,—"the only clue by which the seeming absurdities that occurred in the conduct of that retreat...can be solved or accounted for." R. Cooksey's *Essays*, 92.

[4] Above, p. 123.

[5] See p. 117 *n.*

[6] *Chatham Corr.* i. 298; Add. 6843, ff. 116 sqq.

and dissatisfaction at the conduct of Mitchell, the British envoy at Berlin, who had acquiesced, perhaps too readily, in the Prussian demands for British military assistance[1], and who had declared that England "had done nothing," that "the strength of the nation was melted away in faction," and above all had criticised the waste of men and material in the ill-fated expedition against Rochefort, Pitt's favourite project[2]. Pitt accused him of Hanoverian partialities and insisted on his recall, and Col. Yorke was chosen to take his place.

No better appointment in the circumstances could possibly have been made. On the one hand, the new envoy was in intimate relations with the British ministers at home; on the other, he was a staunch supporter of the continental war and of the alliance with the King of Prussia for whom, as a soldier, he felt an unstinted and enthusiastic admiration. He had for some time been in communication with Frederick, and had been able to render the King some important services. One great subject of correspondence was the dispute between England and the Dutch, which Frederick desired to see settled, in order to secure the support and alliance of the Republic and the augmentation of the Dutch forces[3]. On several occasions Colonel Yorke had forwarded valuable intelligence, and had given advice which the King of Prussia followed, and for which he had received the latter's warmest thanks and acknowledgments[4]. In June and July, 1756, he sent some important information regarding the secret machinations of France, Austria and Russia for Frederick's destruction, which the Prussian envoy supposes to have been procured, either from Robert Keith, the British ambassador at Vienna, from the secret letters of Swart, the Dutch ambassador at St Petersburg, or else from Prince Golowkin, the Russian ambassador at the Hague, the latter being perhaps the most probable, since Col. Yorke was living with him on terms of great

[1] Lord Holderness's letter of reprimand, February 25, 1758, R. O. St. Pap. Holland, who enumerates at the same time all that England had done in support of the K. of P. and repudiates "the unfortunate and mistaken idea that the present system in England implied a lukewarmness to the affairs of the Continent."

[2] Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, ii. 196; Mitchell's *Mem.* by Bissett, i. 164, 412; Add. 6807, ff. 12, 36, 54 sqq.; 6831, ff. 45, 49 sqq.; 6832, ff. 31 sqq., 186 sqq.; and below, pp. 197–8. See a favourable account of M. in Thiébault, *Souvenirs de Fréderic le Grand* (1805), iii. 293.

[3] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xiii. 182, 193, 196, 202, 217, 244; xiv. 28, 105, 230; xv. 164; xvi. 92, 165, 215; xvii. 429, 437.

[4] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xiv. 72, 413; xv. 279, 446 and 447; xvi. 141, 165; xviii. 290, 292.

intimacy[1], and the Russian ministers abroad were known to disapprove of the new political departure of their court. Frederick had for some time had knowledge of the hostile intentions of Austria and Russia through secret access, which he had obtained, to the archives of Dresden and Vienna[2]. But Col. Yorke's communication appears to be the first information in detail of the intentions of the three Powers and of their project of immediately falling upon him, Austria with 80,000 and Russia with 12,000 men. Colonel Yorke advised the scattering of large sums of money at St Petersburg as the only means of preventing the execution of these schemes, since, in general, it was much easier to prevent that court from acting than to induce it to act. At the same time he begged that his name might not be mentioned, in order that the useful sources of information, then at his command, might be still left open, and for fear of compromising Prince Golowkin. In reply, Frederick forwarded to Col. Yorke "un compliment bien affectueux," for his useful intelligence. In presence of such menaces no one could think it strange that he should, on his side, take measures to defend himself[3]. On the occasion of the disastrous and suspicious Convention of Closterseven, in forwarding the official circular repudiating the transaction, so far as the British government was concerned, Col. Yorke added some strong private assurances of his own. On October 6, 1757, accordingly, Frederick wrote to Hellen, his minister at the Hague: "Si dans la situation accablante où je me trouve aujourd'hui, tant par le coup de traître que les Suédois me donnent, que par cette convention ignominieuse,...par où l'Hanovre reste foulé par les Français et son armée réduite et anéantie à rien, mais dont le contre-coup retombe sur moi..., quelque chose peut soulager les peines que j'en ai, ce sont les sentiments vraiment patriotiques que M. de Yorke vous a déclarés confidemment à ce sujet. Aussi devez vous tâcher au mieux de vous conserver l'amitié et la confiance de ce digne ministre pour en être informé de ce qui se passe dans les affaires[4]."

The plan proposed by Colonel Yorke the same month of landing the troops, which had returned from the futile expedition to Rochefort, at the mouth of the Elbe, was strongly approved by Frederick. "Il n'y a rien de mieux pensé[5]." He further informed Frederick, during his operations against the French the same year,

[1] Vol. ii. 154.
[2] Carlyle's *Fred. the Great*, Bk. xvii.
[3] N. 180, f. 245; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xiii. 95–6.
[4] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xv. 401.
[5] *Ib.* 457.

of the communication of his plans to the enemy, which led to the conviction and imprisonment of the Abbé de Prades, the guilty party[1]. In November, 1758, Frederick promises to consider Colonel Yorke's project of gaining the Elector of Bavaria, together with his advice regarding the best means of obtaining from the British government reinforcements for Prince Ferdinand's army[2].

In these circumstances Colonel Yorke might be assured of a hearty welcome in the King of Prussia's camp. On February 14, 1758, he received an urgent summons from the Secretary of State to return to England immediately. He arrived in London on February 28, where he remained for some days in order to visit the King and the ministers and to receive his instructions. He was directed to convince Frederick of the mischievous and embarrassing consequences of his refusal to sign the Convention and of any suspension of the union between the two countries; further, he was to state the impossibility of sending troops to reinforce Prince Ferdinand, and to meet Frederick's request for the despatch of a British squadron to the Baltic[3], to which the cabinet would not consent on account of their desire to avoid war with Russia, where sums of money were at this moment being expended, by a counter demand for a Prussian force to be sent to the support of Prince Ferdinand. On the other hand, he was to inform Frederick of the efforts being made by England to gain on his behalf the Courts of Sweden and Constantinople (which in the event came to nothing), and to discuss a more extensive and permanent alliance with England to continue after the conclusion of the war[4].

He left London again, on March 17, and on April 1 he had arrived at Berlin, where he visited the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel and assured him of the King's support[5]. A few days later, on April 4, Finkenstein, the Prussian minister, forwarded to Frederick an account of the British envoy, whom he found "homme d'esprit et très bien intentionné," and of his conversation.—General Yorke, as he now was, remarked especially on the serious impression which had been made in England by the King of

[1] H. 89, f. 108.

[2] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvii. 405.

[3] This was much desired by Frederick, who had ordered Podewils, the Prussian minister at Berlin, to write to Hellen at the Hague, to engage J. Y. in the project "dass er dieses Verlangen durch seine gute Freunde und Verwandten in England gelten mache." *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 149.

[4] For his instructions see R. O. St. P., Prussia, March 14, 1758; also Mitchell's Diary, Add. MSS. 6867, f. 80, and *Memoirs* (Bisset) ii. 7; *Chatham Corr.* i. 299; Waddington, *La Guerre de Sept Ans*, iii. 209.

[5] R. O. St. P., Prussia, J. Y. to Holderness, April 4.

Prussia's rejection of the subsidies and of the Convention, which had led Pitt to believe that all was at an end, and had aroused grave doubts and suspicions in his mind. "Il me fit," continues the writer, "à cette occasion le caractère de ce secrétaire d'état, disant qu'on ne pouvait pas lui refuser beaucoup de génie et de très grands talents, mais qu'il avait aussi ses faiblesses et entre autres, celle d'être un peu défiant et soupçonneux; qu'il avait formé de tout temps la résolution de rendre le pays d'Hanovre une province dépendante de l'Angleterre, qu'il avait eu le bonheur d'y réussir et d'obtenir par là un but que tous ses prédécesseurs avaient manqué—[this was a notion with which not only Pitt, but the whole nation, was in love]—c'était là proprement ce qui avait causé son opposition à un transport de troupes anglaises."—The chief control of affairs, the envoy continued, was now in Pitt's hands, who was thoroughly well-intentioned for the good cause and zealous for the King of Prussia. The whole of England was Prussian, and the cause of Austria quite fallen. It was the desire of all to see Frederick at the head of Germany, and of Pitt especially to make a permanent alliance to last beyond the termination of the war; and he had been ordered to give assurances that it was not intended to limit the assistance now given to the present year, but to continue it till peace should be secured[1].

Proceeding on his journey, accompanied by Sir John Goodrick, the British envoy to Sweden, General Yorke reached the King of Prussia's camp at Grüssau, in Silesia, on April 10[2]. But before his arrival the situation had undergone a complete transformation. On the news of Mitchell's recall and of Joseph Yorke's appointment, Frederick had yielded and given his consent to the treaty, and had sent Knyphausen to England with instructions to sign it, which was effected on April 11. "Le Général de Yorke," Frederick wrote to the King on April 13, 1758, from Grüssau, "en arrivant ici a été étonné que sa négociation se trouva terminée aussitôt que commencée. J'ai compris que, pour le bien des affaires, il fallait céder et se prêter aux choses possibles[3]."

At the same time he showed great dissatisfaction at the recall of Mitchell, and writing to Michel, his envoy in London, on March 6, he expressed his wish that General Yorke should not be withdrawn from the Hague, and announced his intention always to

[1] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 364; Add. MSS. 6844, f. 52.
[2] Add. 6807, f. 84; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 373.
[3] Add. 6807, f. 73; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 379.

speak his mind freely and clearly regarding what he thought necessary for the good of the common cause to any minister who should be appointed. He added, "Je n'ai rien à dire contre le Sieur Yorke dont j'ai appris à connaître les talents et les bonnes intentions[1]," and sent word to Lord Hardwicke, "how glad he should be to see a son of his[2]." He assured Mitchell that he had directed Knyphausen to do him justice[3]. "The King received me very kindly," writes Mitchell on April 6th; "he sent for me to concert what was proper to be done, as he found Mr Yorke already arrived at Hamburg and upon the road hither; that he was resolved to speak freely to Yorke, and to let him know that he would not be governed by Mr Pitt. 'I refused,' says he, 'to be governed by Kings and I will not be governed by him[4]. Do you know,' says he, 'Mr Pitt's system? It is to humble France without hurting it or doing it any harm; this man, sure, cannot be a great politician[5]. Je crois que votre Monsieur Pitt est devenu fou.... N'est-il pas pendant? Avouez-le[6].'" "Mon ami," he said to Mitchell, on April 25, "vous irez avec moi faire la campagne...ainsi, vous resterez avec moi malgré les ordres de votre cour[7]."

General Yorke, on his side, was far from wishing to exchange his embassy at the Hague, probably at that time the busiest and most important in Europe and where by this time his reputation and influence were firmly established, for the interesting but uneasy post of envoy to the King of Prussia. Lord Hardwicke, in an interview with Pitt, had refused his consent, on his son's behalf, to this change really desired by Pitt with a view of diminishing the Duke of Newcastle's influence abroad; and General Yorke himself obtained assurances from the King, by whose express desire he undertook the mission, that he was to return to Holland[8]. The notion, too, of supplanting a friend in such circumstances, was not an agreeable one. He had already sent word from Berlin through Finkenstein to Frederick that Mitchell's recall had been decided,

[1] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 292; also Mitchell MSS. Add. 6843, ff. 120 sqq.

[2] H. 4, f. 4. [3] Mitchell to Holderness, March 15, 1758. R. O. St. P., Prussia.

[4] Cf. Mitchell's Diary, Add. MSS. 6867, f. 90. "General Yorke told me that the King had said to him at St James's, that Mr Pitt (whom he did not like) did not know mankind, much less how to deal with Kings; for, says he, if the Prussian minister here had pressed to do something that I [did] not choose to do, and I had refused, as the King of Prussia has done, what could that minister do, or would it be right or just to recall him?"

[5] *Ib.* ff. 76 sqq. and f. 128.

[6] Mitchell's *Narrative of Maj.-Gen. Yorke's Mission*, Add. 6867, ff. 120 sqq.

[7] *Ib.* f. 90.

[8] p. 199; Abreu to Wall, March 17, 1758, Chatham MSS. 92; *Chatham Corr.* i. 300.

but that it might be prevented by Frederick's intervention[1]. At the same time, he wrote to Lord Holderness, urging strongly the wisdom of cancelling the order[2].

The presence of the two British envoys, after General Yorke's arrival, created a somewhat awkward situation; and it is no wonder that Mitchell regarded his supplanter with considerable jealousy and wrote about him at first with some ill-humour. "The General," he declared in his Diary, "had brought likewise with him two messengers who were kept very alert, as he was resolved to do much business....The General...assured me that he had come unwillingly; that it was put upon him and that he had no intention to stay. But I could easily see, notwithstanding all these declarations, that he was by no means averse to the commission, and that he thought he could not fail of captivating the King of Prussia[3]."

It reflects great credit on both parties that the feelings of jealousy and dissension, so naturally aroused in these circumstances, instead of being increased, were, on the contrary, during their mutual intercourse, by means of tact and good humour, mitigated and overcome[4]. General Yorke had already written to Mitchell before his arrival in order to smooth the way:—that he "learnt that he [Mitchell] had already raised all the difficulties that had suspended the signing of the Convention, which made the principal object of his mission," and that on seeing him he would explain "the whole of this odd scene, in which I have been involved, much to my surprise and against the inclination of my greatest friends, the King having no intention to remove me from the Hague and being determined I should return there as soon as possible. In the meanwhile, you need be under no concern about yourself, as I shall be able to explain to you. You know my sincerity and regard for you, and I flatter myself that, since somebody was to be sent extraordinarily, that you will be less displeased at my being the person than another[5]." By April 26, Mitchell is able to write to Lord Holderness: "My situation at present is very awkward and would have been disagreeable, but General Yorke's arrival, and his behaviour since, has made everything easy, and

[1] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 366. Mitchell MSS. Add. 6867, f. 90.

[2] p. 199. [3] Add. 6867, ff. 78–80.

[4] Cf. Schaefer, *Geschichte des Siebenjährigen Kriegs*, i. 570, "Mitchell's Verstimmung über Yorke's Sendung gibt sich in seinem Tagebuche und anderen Aufzeichnungen unverholen kund: um so mehr sind wir Yorke das Zeuchniss schuldig, dass er sich in der ganzen Sache durchaus ehrenhaft und wohlwollend benahm."

[5] Add. 6836, f. 96.

I am persuaded what has passed between him and the King of Prussia will be of the greatest service to the common cause. His Prussian Majesty has in private to me, and in the strongest manner, expressed the satisfaction he had in the frequent conversations with the General. I cannot conclude this letter without acquainting your Lordship that I am under the greatest obligations to General Yorke for his candid, friendly and fair behaviour towards me. He has explained many things which I could not have guessed at[1]: in return I have been open and free with him and will trust everything to the report he shall make[2]." On June 7, Mitchell received the intimation of the renewal of his appointment, and on June 10, on General Yorke's departure, he writes: "He and I have lived and parted good friends which is not always the case with heirs apparent[3]."

Meanwhile, General Yorke, whose visit extended from April 10 to June 9, had received a cordial and distinguished welcome from the King, and had been treated with especial consideration. Following the Prussian army to its various encampments, he lived with Frederick on terms of some intimacy, and by the King's express orders he was allowed constant access to his person[4]. He had several long conferences with Frederick, which ended in mutual satisfaction and perfect agreement on all the topics debated.

He gave the King of Prussia strong assurances of the firm intention of the British ministers to support the war, and of the King of England's good disposition towards him; while Frederick, on his side, showed greater moderation in his demands, explained his hesitation in signing the Convention, and responded warmly to the British proposal of a larger and permanent alliance. He entered into, and approved of, the British attacks upon the French dominions in the New World, assured General Yorke of his fixed hostility towards that Power, and enlivened the dinner hour by

[1] Probably a reference to Pitt's attitude.

[2] It must be admitted that the force and disinterestedness of this testimony is considerably weakened by the following extract from Mitchell's Diary (Add. MSS. 6867, f. 90), "General Yorke...showed me his public letters, a private letter from the Duke of Newcastle and one from his father, and the answers he was proposing to make to them, in which he had not spared compliments on the manner of my receiving him, etc. As I easily saw the *but* of all this communicativeness etc., I repaid in kind by writing a letter to the Earl of Holderness commending the General's behaviour etc. which I showed to him."

[3] Mitchell MSS. Add. 6831, ff. 52–4, 6807, f. 88. *Mem.* by Bissett, i. 412 sqq.

[4] "La Majesté vient de m'ordonner expressément...de dire...que sa Majesté sera charmée de voir plus souvent ici M. le Général, qui n'avait qu'à venir aussi souvent qu'il lui plairait pour voir sa Majesté." *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 384; Eichel to Mitchell, Add. 6847, ff. 55 sqq.; Mitchell to Holderness, June 9, 1758, R. O. St. P., Prussia.

ridicule of the French and by telling stories at their expense, while he raised great expectations, perhaps not very sincere ones, when once the Austrians had been driven back and annihilated, of joining in a final united attack upon the hereditary enemy of Great Britain. He further showed his confidence in his guest by unfolding his plan of operations for the coming campaign[1].

General Yorke's mission, therefore, which terminated on June 9, on which day he quitted the King at Kleinlathein, although its principal object had been achieved before his arrival, was not without advantageous results. His coming had accelerated, and probably had occasioned the signing of the Convention, the ratifications of which were exchanged with him on May 22[2]. The visit to the King of Prussia's camp and Frederick's engaging wit and good humour and attractive charm, which he knew so well how to employ, created in the British envoy an attachment to his person and, if possible, still greater enthusiasm in his cause and confidence in his success. He himself made a very favourable impression upon the King who, writing to Hellen, his minister at the Hague, declares, "Je l'ai trouvé un homme bien aimable[3]," and hoped to turn to account his influence and connections with the British ministry. He expressed regrets at his departure, gave orders that he should be treated with special distinction upon his journey home and, as a mark of his favour, presented him with his portrait set with diamonds[4].

[1] pp. 199–214; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 377, Frederick tb Finkenstein, April 12.

[2] *Ib.* xvii. 28.

[3] *Ib.* xvi. 380 *n.*; H. 25, f. 43; Add. MSS. 6832, f. 197.

[4] "Comme j'ai tout sujet d'être satisfait de lui," Frederick writes to Finkenstein on June 10, "et de la manière qu'il s'est comporté envers moi pendant le temps qu'il a résidé ici, j'ai résolu de lui faire le présent ordinaire des ministres qui ont séjourné à ma cour, et dont j'ai été content....Ma volonté est que vous choisissiez d'abord un portrait de prix garni de diamants pour le lui offrir de ma part avec un compliment convenable. Au surplus, je mets le prix de ce portrait à 1500 écus, à peu près, que vous choisirez au mieux ...et garni en sorte que vous le saurez faire passer auprès du public à un prix de 3000 écus. Je n'ai pas pu me dispenser de donner ce présent au dit Yorke, quoique je m'en serais bien passer dans ma situation présente où j'ai tant d'autres dépenses à soutenir pour les frais de la guerre; mais comme c'est un homme ambitieux, qui cependant sait assez bien cacher son orgueil et qui d'ailleurs est d'un grand parentage en Angleterre, que je veux ménager dans le moment présent, je veux que vous le flattiez au mieux pendant le temps qu'il restera à Berlin, et que vous ayez soin qu'on lui fasse toute sorte de distinctions afin qu'il en parte pénétré." *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvii. 58; also Eichel to J. Y. announcing the gift, H. 9, f. 247. One would wish to know the useful secret of passing off a present at double its value and if the Prussian minister succeeded in this part of the King's commands. The portrait at least turned out but "a bad likeness." H. 41, f. 58.

The expedition did much to improve the relations between the two countries and especially between the two Kings, and strengthened the foundations of the famous alliance which had so great an influence upon the course of the war[1]. The maintenance of 50,000 German troops was voted forthwith by Parliament without opposition, as well as the subsidy to Frederick of £670,000, and a British force was despatched to garrison Emden[2].

General Yorke returned to the Hague on the evening of June 30, travelling by Breslau and Berlin where he received, by the King's instructions, a specially distinguished reception. The conclusion of his Prussian mission had been hastened by the necessity of his presence in Holland, in order to bring about the long-projected accession of the Republic to the alliance against France[3], in furthering which he had now full authority to use Frederick's name, who attached great importance to its accomplishment[4]. All schemes, however, of this kind had proved impracticable on account of the jealousies arising from the Dutch contraband trade on one side and the depredations of the British privateers on the other. The piratical confiscations of the latter had aroused universal resentment throughout Europe, and it happened sometimes that ships set free by the British Courts, were again seized on their emerging from the ports. On the other hand, the British authorities maintained that confiscation only followed in the due course of law and in the absence of any adequate defence, and pointed out that the King to whom the Dutch appealed, could not overrule the decisions of the Courts. Moreover, France, in consequence of her loss of the command of the sea, now carried on, with the aid of neutrals, her West Indian trade, of which the greater share was

[1] pp. 209, 230.

[2] Waddington, ii. 208 sqq.; and for the whole incident below, pp. 197, 199 sqq.; Carlyle's *Fred. the Great*, Bk. xviii, Chap. xi.; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi., xvii.; cf. Lady Hervey who had no more love for the Yorkes than her late amiable husband. (*Letters to the Rev. Ed. Morris*, 237–8.) March 4, April 6, 1758. "Mr Yorke is setting out to execute a private commission to him [the K. of P.]. I wish they had chose any other man, for by what I am told of the King, and what I know of the minister, he is the most unlikely man on earth to succeed with him....He is no fop, nothing like it; but he is a coxcomb, overbearing, insolent and always aiming at a sort of subtlety, and will try and think he can overreach the King of Prussia. He has no address, no good breeding, but utters everything as if he expected to have his parts, sagacity and *finesse* admired. This is the man; judge then how proper to succeed with the person he is sent to." Cf. also her strange and ridiculous observations upon Lord H. of October 21, 1761, and Horace Walpole's nonsense. *George II*, iii. 111.

[3] He did not even visit England to give an account of his mission, to which the old King had been looking forward. Lord Holderness, R. O. St. P., Holland, June 27.

[4] pp. 204, 213.

appropriated by the Dutch[1]. The English Courts refused to acknowledge the legality of this commerce, and in February 1759, a counter-project in answer to a project of an agreement forwarded by the Dutch, drawn up by Lord Hardwicke, was despatched to the Hague. It was here pointed out that all the Powers of Europe had consistently forbidden the trading of other nations with their respective colonies, both in time of peace and of war, and that this restriction had become a universal law. It was now proposed that Holland and England should agree to consider such trade as outside the scope of treaties, to be dealt with according to the law of nations and as illegal[2]. The Dutch, moreover, were the chief providers to the French of naval stores and contraband of war. In September 1759, cannon, bought by the French in Sweden, were landed in Amsterdam in spite of General Yorke's protests[3]. It was in vain that he endeavoured to raise their fears on the surrender of Ostend and Nieuport by Austria to the French[4]. They played off France against England, and the more pressing the menaces of the French, the higher rose the Dutch demands against this country[5]. Notwithstanding these provocations, General Yorke had consistently advised a policy of moderation and concession in view of the more important object to be achieved, in accordance with the strong desire lately expressed to him by the King of Prussia, and in order to defeat the hopes of the enemy[6].

The Duke of Newcastle was in sympathy with these views[7], and through his influence some disjointed attempts were made to conciliate the Dutch[8]; but the policy of concession was opposed by Pitt[9], and little was done to meet the Dutch complaints till Denmark joined her grievances to those of Holland[10], and a general reunion of the Northern Powers against England was threatened. In 1759 the Dutch Commissioners arrived in England to press the

[1] See an instance of this kind in which Lord H. was one of the Lords Commissioners, who decided such cases on appeal, and Charles Yorke appeared as counsel. *Grenville Papers*, i. 295.

[2] p. 231; H. 4, f. 63; R. O. St. P., Holland, Holderness to J. Y., February 9, 1759; D. of N. to J. Y., N. 202, f. 347. See also vol. ii. 312.

[3] Waddington, iii. 422 sqq.

[4] See his remonstrance in Entick, *Hist. of the late War*, iii. 24.

[5] N. 207, f. 78.

[6] A. Bourguet, *Études sur la Politique Étrangère de Choiseul*, 39–130.

[7] N. 205, f. 187.

[8] Mitchell MSS. Add. 6836, f. 56; see also f. 62.

[9] Walpole, *George II*, iii. 139 sqq. See also Holderness to Mitchell, Add. 6832, f. 234; *Chatham Corr.* i. 356, 396.

[10] J. Y. to Holderness, January 12, 1759, R. O. St. P., Holland.

matter further[1], and had an interview with Lord Hardwicke on July 5. An Act was passed through Parliament for controlling and punishing piracies and acts of violence, and an open rupture was avoided, though without the attainment of any real agreement or political union[2].

During General Yorke's sojourn with Frederick, Schweidnitz had fallen into the hands of the Prussians, on April 18, 1758; but on July 1, the Austrians succeeded in compelling Frederick to raise the siege of Olmütz. On August 25, he won the bloody and costly victory of Zorndorf over the Russians, who had now invaded his dominions; but on October 14 he was surprised and defeated at Hochkirch by the Austrians, and the campaign ended with two rapid movements by which he raised the siege of Neiss in Silesia and protected Dresden.

In Africa, the fort of St Louis, at the mouth of the Senegal, was taken on May 1, and the island of Goree captured on December 29. In America, a great victory was gained by Amherst, Wolfe and Admiral Boscawen by the conquest of Louisburg and Cape Breton on July 27[3]. An attack made by Forbes on Fort Duquesne, on November 25, was also successful; on the other hand, an ill-planned attempt against Fort Ticonderoga by Abercrombie entirely failed. A fleet was again sent into the Mediterranean, and several men-of-war were captured from the enemy.

It was not, however, till the following year, 1759, the *annus mirabilis* of English history, after a long period of careful preparation, united effort and national self-sacrifice, that the British forces appeared supreme in all parts of the world. Ninety-one thousand British troops stood under arms this year, without including the militia or the foreign troops in British pay, the latter numbering nearly 7000[4]. Sixty thousand men were voted for the navy. The estimates amounted to £12,761,000[5], at that time an incredible sum, but which was cheerfully provided by the House of Commons, not only without opposition but without comment[6]. "At present our unanimity is prodigious," writes Walpole, "You

[1] N. 207, f. 437.

[2] R. O. St. P., Holland, Corr. between J. Y. and Holderness from July 21, 1758, to January 12, 1759; below, pp. 170, 232. Waddington, ii. 79–83, iii. 422 sqq.; J. C. Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War*, ii. 5 sqq.; Ruville, ii. 192, 197.

[3] H. 69, f. 266.

[4] Walpole's *George II*, iii. 151; Ruville, ii. 217.

[5] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 938 and see *Annual Reg.* ii. 171.

[6] Chesterfield's *Letters* (Bradshaw), iii. 1248.

would as soon hear NO from an old maid as from the House of Commons....The Parliament is all harmony and thinks of nothing but giving away 12 more millions. Mr Pitt made the most artful speech...provoked, called for, defied objections; promised enormous expense, demanded never to be judged by events[1]."

He need not have feared this criterion. In July, Rodney bombarded Havre. On August 17, Admiral Boscawen beat the French fleet off Lagos, captured three warships and destroyed two others. On November 20, Sir Edward Hawke, after blockading Brest, gained a great victory, in the midst of a terrific storm, over the enemy in Quiberon Bay, inflicting a loss upon them of six ships at the expense of two of his own, which were unfortunately shipwrecked. Other squadrons watched Dunkirk, occupied the Channel, defended the English coasts and brought to naught all the French plans of invasion which, projected on a large scale, included a landing in Scotland and the surprise of Edinburgh[2]. On May 1, a combined naval and military expedition, after a failure at Martinique, captured the island of Guadeloupe. In Canada a great military scheme, which depended, however, entirely upon the command of the sea, had long been in preparation. It included three separate expeditions with Quebec as the final aim, which were now entrusted respectively to Generals Prideaux and Johnson, Amherst and Wolfe. The full project was not, indeed, carried out this year, but the capture of Niagara by Johnson[3] in July, and above all of Quebec by Saunders and the navy, and the immortal Wolfe, in September—the culminating triumph, achieved in spite of overwhelming difficulties and with incomplete forces[4]—wrested for ever the possession of Canada from the French, and assigned the sovereignty in the New World to the British race[5].

In India, the strongly organised attacks of the French upon Madras and upon Patna, in February and April, were completely defeated, and the same fate met a Dutch expedition in October.

[1] *Letters*, iv. 218, 223; *George II*, iii. 149. [2] Waddington, iii. 364.

[3] Sir William Johnson, Bart. (1715–1774), Superintendent of the Six Nations.

[4] Add. 6836, f. 130.

[5] The value of the co-operation of the navy in this expedition, formerly overlooked, is now fully understood. (See Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power*, 294; Fortescue, *Hist. of the British Army*, ii. 387; J. C. Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War*, i. 472.) The most impressive feature, however, of the great victory is not the share that either of the two services had separately in it, but the new spirit of union and co-operation between them, shown in the combined operations. The perseverance and enterprise of the leaders, moreover, in the face of unexpected difficulties, are very striking.

In Germany, Prince Ferdinand, after a reverse at Bergen, near Frankfort, on April 13, followed by a retreat, which seemed likely at one time to end in another French occupation of Hanover, gained, by a clever tactical manœuvre, a great victory over superior forces at Minden, on August 1, the completeness of which, however, was marred by the strange refusal of Lord George Sackville, commanding the British forces and the cavalry on the right, to charge the retreating enemy[1]. "Il perdit...la plus belle occasion," wrote Prince Ferdinand, with crushing contempt, "qui ait peut-être jamais existé d'acquérir la gloire."

The misconduct of this individual, had it been a mere case of cowardice or loss of nerve, would not have deserved the notice of the historian, since such instances must constantly recur, till frail human nature has purged itself of all its weaknesses. But this was no common failure of physical courage, and was in fact another example of that "neglect of duty" and conscious betrayal and subordination of the interests of the country to a petty personal aim, which had been already presented in the case of the unhappy Byng.

Lord George Sackville, third and youngest son of the first Duke of Dorset, was a person of considerable ability, but one who had already in Ireland appeared very little attentive to the public interest when his own ambition was concerned[2]. On the other hand, he had given proof on several occasions of personal courage, notably at Fontenoy, where he received a dangerous wound at the head of his regiment. His conduct and military ability had been the subject of special praise by the Duke of Cumberland. He had, moreover, been well spoken of by Wolfe[3]. He showed astonishing firmness and spirit during his court-martial. With characteristic prudence he had attached himself, at the close of the old King's reign, to the Prince of Wales's party at Leicester House; and by this influence, and in opposition to the King, who did not conceal his strong dislike and distrust, he had obtained the command of the British forces in Germany. He went out as the representative of the future King in the army, flattered by the Princess and Lord

[1] pp. 234 sqq. [2] See above, vol. ii. 49–50.

[3] The Duke wrote, "[He] has shown not only his courage, but also a disposition to his trade that I don't always find in those of a higher rank." *Hist. MSS. Comm.* Rep. iv. app. 281; Wright's *Life of Wolfe*, 133. No credence can be given to the accounts, *e.g.* in Walpole's *George II*, iii. 191, which throw doubts upon his courage, since such anecdotes are always prominent after the event. Cf. the case of Byng above, vol. ii. 347. Writing on October 24, 1757, to the D. of N. Lord H. mentions Lord G. as "generally allowed to have courage and abilities." N. 190, f. 254.

Bute, with his ambition and self-esteem stirred and excited, jealous of Lord Granby and discontented at his subordination to Prince Ferdinand who, with all his family, notwithstanding their illustrious services, was obnoxious to the Princess of Wales. While in Germany, he kept up an intimate and captious correspondence with Lord Bute on military affairs, accused Prince Ferdinand of carrying on the campaign solely in the interests of the King of Prussia, reflected on his management of the troops, caballed against him in the army and hoped to succeed him. Indeed, a very few days before the battle, the refusal to grant him the full military patronage, which had been much pressed by Leicester House, where it was desired to secure a subservient chief of the army in accordance with the plan long formed of establishing royal supremacy in the new reign, drew upon Pitt, who hitherto had basked in the favour and under the protection of that power, some extremely improper menaces from Lord Bute, on August 7[1].

In these circumstances, it can scarcely be doubted that ill-will towards Prince Ferdinand and the plans of the ministers were the cause and motive of Lord George Sackville's tardy and lingering obedience of orders, and of the refusal to charge with the cavalry at the critical moment,—a refusal which his contemporaries, unaware of what went on behind the scenes, attributed to physical cowardice. General Yorke at the Hague, who, as an experienced soldier himself, would not underrate the difficulties of active command, and was probably a more lenient critic than a civilian, who usually only judges of military merit by success, thought very ill of the affair, and sent no reply to a communication made to him by Lord George on the subject[2]. Indeed, the disgraced officer found very few, besides the Prince of Wales and his followers, to take his part. The Prince, however, continued his support and eagerly defended his conduct, and through Lord Bute's representations and threats, he was permitted, after he had suffered Prince Ferdinand's public censure, to return to England at his own request, instead of being recalled or dismissed. It was only his own audacious persistence, moreover, in demanding it, that drew upon him a court-martial[3]

[1] H. 72, f. 14. *Life of Granby* by W. E. Manners, 102, and see *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 232; *Chatham Corr.* i. 416; *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Mrs Stopford Sackville, i. 54, 310, 312–22; *Hist. MSS. Comm.* Rep. ix. pt iii. 11; and above, p. 119.

[2] p. 236. See also H. 51, f. 79; H. 9, f. 364; N. 209, f. 494.

[3] The question whether Lord G., as no longer holding a military commission, was liable to a court-martial was by Lord H.'s advice referred to the Judges, who gave their opinion in the affirmative. *Chatham Corr.* ii. 23–4.

with its unfavourable verdict, declaring him "unfit to serve his Majesty in any military capacity whatever," a sentence which the old King, with the same just severity which had refused to condone the crime of Byng, ordered to be read out as "a censure worse than death," at the head of every British regiment, in every quarter of the globe[1].

This unpleasant incident appeared all the more unworthy and odious in contrast with the deeds of heroism performed in all parts of the world, which exalted the name of Great Britain to heights before unknown in its history. At the close of this year France had lost twenty-nine men-of-war and thirty-five frigates, many of which were added to the British navy, which now amounted to a hundred and six men-of-war of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty guns[2]. Twenty-four thousand French soldiers, moreover, were prisoners in England[3].

Meanwhile, the fortunes of Frederick, who with 130,000 men was called upon to confront 250,000 of the enemy[4], had by no means corresponded to the British victories of this year. The Russians had again advanced into his dominions, and an attempt to prevent their junction with the Austrians had failed and resulted in a defeat, on July 23. The King, then commanding in person, encountered their forces, which numbered 80,000 to his 50,000, at Kunersdorf, near Frankfort-on-the-Oder, on August 13, 1759. A great battle ensued which, at one time, inclined in favour of the Prussians; but the King, following up his advantage too eagerly by another attack with his exhausted troops, the advantage became an overwhelming defeat. Nearly the whole of his army was destroyed, and he himself escaped capture with some difficulty. So hopeless did the situation appear, that he resolved to give up the great struggle and seek death by his own hand. "Mon malheur est de vivre encore," he wrote to Finkenstein at Berlin. "Je crois tout perdu; je ne survivrai point à la perte de ma patrie. Adieu pour jamais[5]!" The Russians, however, had also suffered great losses. They were on far from friendly terms with the Austrians and they began to retreat, without attempting any

[1] pp. 235 sqq., 245; H. 51, ff. 86, 140, 143; H. 545, ff. 216 sqq.; H. 70, ff. 222, 224; N. 208, ff. 429 sqq.; N. 211, f. 323; Ruville, ii. 243; *Chatham Corr.* i. 327, 367, 416–7, 423; Walpole's *George II*, iii. 191 sqq., 212, 251, 265; *Letters*, iv. 293, 297, 300; Dodington's *Diary*, 365; *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

[2] Ruville, ii. 277.

[3] Walpole's *George II*, iii. 151.

[4] Waddington, iii. 117.

[5] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xviii. 481 sqq.; Walpole's *George II*, iii. 201.

further act of hostility. Frederick now returned to Saxony, where he had already lost Dresden on September 14, and where another disaster awaited him in the defeat and capitulation of General Finck, with his whole division of 12,000 men, to the Austrians at Maxen, on November 20. Defeated in the field, his military resources exhausted, and destitute of funds, nothing, it appeared, could have saved him, but the great victories gained this year by his ally against the French and the reinforcement of 12,000 men, sent under the Hereditary Prince of Brunswick in December to his aid[1].

The British triumphs and successes now seemed to offer a great opportunity of negotiating a peace with France[2], before the alliance between France and Spain, so dangerous to British interests, and which it had been the aim of France since the beginning of the war to secure, should be accomplished. During the lifetime of Ferdinand VI, Spain had been entirely on the side of England. The Queen was Portuguese and devoted to England. General Wall, a minister of British nationality, had the full control of Spanish foreign policy, and Sir Benjamin Keene, who had been the British ambassador in Madrid for 30 years, held a paramount influence which entirely effaced French diplomacy.

But on the accession of the new Bourbon King, Charles III., the son of Elizabeth Farnese, on August 10, 1759, whose sympathies were entirely with his own family and against England, and who had formerly at Naples been subjected to a British ultimatum, a new scene opened. He at once showed himself more active and more ambitious than his feeble predecessor, and more sensitive with regard to the honour and interests of his country. The depredations of the British privateers had long been a cause of complaint by the Spanish court. Already, in September 1757, they had formed the subject of heated remonstrances by Wall to Keene[3], who had been instructed to negotiate an alliance between the two states. "What are we to expect from you," he asked, "in your successes, if such is your treatment in the present state of your affairs[4]?" Again, only a fortnight before the late King's death, Wall had given the significant warning to Lord Bristol, Sir Benjamin

[1] H. 17, f. 78; Ruville, ii. 304; Walpole's *George II*, iii. 248.

[2] It was advocated in a very able pamphlet "A Letter to Two Great Men." H. 71, f. 146.

[3] Above, vol. i. 217 *n.*, and below, p. 251.

[4] *Chatham Corr.* i. 263 sqq. and Chatham MSS. 92.

Keene's successor at Madrid: "Spain is at present separated from France; she shall continue so while I have interest here, if you will but assist me. Beware, by any neglect, to force us back into the hands of our neighbours." He urged the necessity of giving satisfaction for the depredations of the privateers and the wisdom of employing Charles III. as a mediator, which need only be a compliment.

No attention, however, was paid to this advice, and no serious effort was made by Pitt to gain the new sovereign. The illegal capture of Spanish ships and property continued and increased, and the seizure of a French ship in the open sea from the protection of a Spanish vessel aroused special resentment. Moreover, towards the end of August 1759 Pitt rejected the Spanish King's mediation which had been offered[1].

This mediation was eagerly accepted by France on September 21, 1759, who took care to rouse Spanish jealousies by suggesting the grievance of the British aggrandisement in the New World, and the necessity, in the interests of Spain, that the balance of conquests in America, established by the Peace of Utrecht, should not be disturbed. France urged further that the Spanish mediation should be an armed one, and that Charles III. should announce his intention of declaring war against the party, which should refuse to listen to reason and to his proposals. The French conditions of peace followed, which appeared to cancel the whole of the British conquests and to return to the *status quo ante bellum*. The news of the fall of Quebec brought the two Powers, under the sense of a common danger, still nearer. Charles III. declared that this event had frozen his blood. He was convinced that if France succumbed to England, Spain would surely follow; and he showed his intention of uniting with France as soon as possible[2]. In October, therefore, the Prince of San Severino, Charles III.'s envoy in England, following the direction of France, announced in an interview with Pitt, "that his Catholic Majesty could not regard with indifference the great advance made by the English in America, or suffer passively the balance of possessions, established by the treaty of Utrecht in that continent, to be altered or destroyed."

It is not at all impossible that a more prudent and careful diplomacy and a greater regard for the interests and susceptibilities of the new King of Spain, immediately on his succession and in the earlier stages of the negotiation, including the immediate cession of

[1] p. 236. [2] Waddington, iii. 436.

the illegal establishments in Honduras and the Mosquito Shore, might have mitigated his fears and jealousy of Great Britain, and have prevented the serious consequences which supervened. The support of Wall, also, might have been retained, who was obliged now to adopt an attitude of hostility, to avoid the charge of being "more devoted to England than to Spain[1]," and to keep his power. But when once these jealousies had been embodied in a menace, there could be no thought of accepting an arbitration, no longer even in appearance neutral, but obviously intended to be exercised in favour of the enemy[2]. Pitt, accordingly, answered the representation with the announcement of the intended proposal to be made by Great Britain and Prussia to all the Powers for a congress to settle a general peace; and to a subsequent note of Abreu, the Spanish ambassador, of December 5, 1759, in which the same menace was repeated, he made the same reply, in addition denying that the Peace of Utrecht had established any equilibrium between France and England in North America, and throwing the responsibility for the hostilities upon France[3].

To several other negotiations for peace Pitt offered the same determined opposition. The mediation of Denmark who, alarmed by the approach and encroachments of Russia, was desirous of peace and to whom Choiseul, the French foreign minister, now turned, was rejected unanimously by the cabinet as a suspected channel, controlled by the Hanoverian ministers, who probably intended to exploit the King's electoral weaknesses. Certain unostentatious conferences between Lord Howe and the Duc d'Aiguillon[4], Commander of the French forces in Brittany, preparing for the invasion of England, were discouraged by Pitt[5]; and a separate negotiation, begun in the new year by Frederick himself with France, met with his strong disapproval[6]. The reply of the Powers to the project of the congress was not delivered to Prince Louis of Brunswick, the Commander of the Dutch forces, through whom the negotiation was transacted, till April 3, 1760, and amounted, as might have been expected, to a refusal. German matters only were to be discussed in the congress, and France was ready to treat for a peace for England separately through the

[1] *Chatham Corr.* i. 473. [2] p. 241.
[3] Waddington, iii. 437–8; and H. to Pitt approving, Chatham MSS. 39.
[4] Governor of Brittany, later foreign Secretary of State.
[5] Wadd. iii. 461 sqq., 499 sqq.; *Chatham Corr.* i. 463, ii. 48.
[6] Wadd. iii. 519 sqq.; *Chatham Corr.* i. 460. N. 219, f. 278.

mediation of Spain[1]. Further negotiations begun by General Yorke at the Hague, in January 1760, with D'Affry, the French ambassador, by order of the British ministers, after several interviews and conferences, at some of which a successful issue seemed not improbable, broke off on the same point, the inclusion of Prussia, which, as Lord Holderness wrote to General Yorke on April 25, 1760, was a *sine qua non*.

In all these negotiations, including those for the proposed mediation of Spain, the separation of the maritime and colonial dispute with England from the continental war had been the principal object of the French; for owing to the burdensome obligations by which France was now tied to Austria, it was impossible to include Prussia. Writing on July 8, 1759, Choiseul declares the impracticability, for this reason, of making "aucune insinuation de paix à l'impératrice reine, à moins qu'elle ne soit en possession tranquille de la Silésie." On December 24, 1759, he turned for help to Ossun, Charles III's minister. He represented that the royal houses of France and Spain were of the same family, and that an alliance between them would be a more secure support to France than that with Austria, who would probably, before long, again incline towards England and whose sole object in the war, namely the annihilation of Prussia, was one with which France had no sympathy. The only escape from the embarrassment in which France was placed was to make a separate peace with England under Spanish mediation, and the three Powers could then together decide the fate of Germany[2]. The same points, the refusal of Austria to make peace and the consequent impossibility of including Prussia, at any rate formally, in the preliminary negotiation, were constantly urged by D'Affry, the French ambassador at the Hague, upon General Yorke. The latter, who had shown some incredulity concerning the sincerity of France, writes to Lord Holderness on April 8, shortly before the rupture of communications, after a further interview with D'Affry: "He did not conceal from me the difficulties they had about the Court of Vienna, and that they could not with any decency make such a previous declaration excluding the Queen of Hungary [*i.e.* that demanded

[1] Waddington, iii. 498.

[2] *Ib.* iii. 440 sqq.; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 29; Ruville, ii. 290; Record Office, St. Pap., Holland, January 1760 sqq.; N. 217, ff. 171, 244 sqq., 408; N. 218, ff. 63, 214, 256; N. 219, ff. 314, 367; A. Bourguet, *Études sur la Polit. Étrangère de Choiseul*, 131–177; Add. 6836, ff. 137 sqq.; H. 10, ff. 9, 18; H. 17, f. 101.

by Lord Holderness, 'that the Court of France shall expressly and confidentially agree that His Majesty and allies and *nommément* the King of Prussia, are to be comprehended in the *accommodement à faire*']. The manner in which he pressed me upon this point and the stress he laid upon it were remarkable, and savoured strongly of a desire to treat without the Court of Vienna, provided it could be managed with decency." And in a secret letter of the same date he continues, "The reserve the French ambassador observes towards the minister of their allies here, the awkward uneasiness he showed lest they should know we had met, and several expressions he let drop about them and their courts, would incline me to think that peace is the object of France, and that the most pacific party is the most prevalent." At their last meeting, on May 6, D'Affry repudiated any desire to ruin the King of Prussia, and declared that when once France and England were agreed and the consequent withdrawal of their armies from Germany secured, they would willingly unite in measures for his preservation; but to publish such intentions previously was impossible[1].

Nevertheless, the exclusion of Prussia in the preliminary negotiations, however reasonable and necessary from the French point of view, and however unimportant the restriction might have proved in its real consequences, met with Pitt's determined resistance and caused both the rejection of the Spanish mediation and the rupture of this last attempt at a peace at the Hague. His reasons, as he explained to Frederick's envoys, for this hostile attitude, were his fears that the negotiations were only intended by France to divide and create jealousies between England and Prussia, as well as to undermine his own power and popularity[2]; but it is remarkable that the principal person concerned, Frederick himself, had no such misgivings, and attached much less importance than Pitt to his formal exclusion from the preliminary negotiations. He expressed to Mitchell, in May 1759, great anxiety to procure a peace. On June 1759, he had written to the King, in accordance with the suggestion of his envoys in London, in favour of the congress, and after his defeat at Kunersdorf in August he regarded the congress as his sole way of escape[3]. In January 1760, he expressed his

[1] R. O., St. Pap., Holland.

[2] Schaefer, ii. *a*, 580; *Pol. Hist. F.'s*, xix. 290.

[3] N. 206, ff. 192, 399, 404; H. 70, f. 259; *Chat. Corr.* i. 407, 413; Ruville, ii. 281; a different opinion is however expressed in *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xviii. 630 and later, in April 1760, xix. 261. See further below, p. 147, *n.* 2. It is impossible to follow Herr v. Ruville in thinking that Frederick's demands for peace were not genuine, but only expressed by

hopes that a separate negotiation would be begun between France and England to prepare the way for a general peace[1]. On February 4, 1760, writing to Knyphausen, he approves once more of the separate peace between England and France, which would detach the latter from Austria and Russia and place him in a position of equality to confront his foes[2]; and on March 13, his representatives in London declared their approval of the continuance of the negotiation at the Hague, on the basis of a peace between England and France, on the understanding that Prussian interests would be considered at a later stage[3].

Lord Hardwicke, whose opinion was shared and supported by the Duke of Newcastle, urged the wisdom of making the best use of the French offers, and pointed out that in the course of the negotiations the necessity of including the affairs of Germany would be shown irresistibly[4]. General Yorke, himself, who had special opportunities for discovering the real intentions and designs of the enemy and who was by no means prejudiced in favour of peace, states emphatically, on March 25, his conviction of the favourable opportunity now offered and of the probability that France, with a little encouragement, would quit her allies[5]; and in a private letter to his brother, Lord Royston, of May 6, 1760, he does not hesitate to express his regret at the breaking off of the negotiations by the British minister, and regards it as a serious mistake. Willingness to negotiate, he points out, did not entail any restrictions in concluding. The French were themselves at this moment negotiating against Russia, jealous concerning Austria and desirous of saving the King of Prussia. Spain was refusing to join France, either as a friend or as a mediator[6].

According to a recent narrative, based upon a careful investigation of these events, especially from the French point of view, a great opportunity of terminating the struggle was now lost by Pitt[7]. As Choiseul advanced, Pitt drew back. He broke off the

the desire of Pitt to quiet the peace party and as a blind, devoid of any real purpose, though there is little doubt that they were so used by Pitt. See below, p. 148 *n.*

[1] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xix. 4; *Chat. Corr.* ii. 29.

[2] *Ib.* xix. 61. See also xviii. 341–2, xix. 13, 15, 25, 26, 71, 77, 100, 115–181, 277, 280. But occasionally, as the negotiations dragged on without result, he had doubts or expressed opposition, xix. 117, 151, 157, 178, 186, 188, 219, 232, 261, 273, and on the approaching rupture of the negotiations expressed great gratitude to Pitt, who had refused to be duped, 290 sqq., 329.

[3] Memorandum in Lord Hardwicke's handwriting, H. 71, f. 175.

[4] p. 242.

[5] Below; see also Add. 6836, f. 139.

[6] H. 17, ff. 120, 125.

[7] Waddington, iii. 539–541.

negotiations on a question which might have been considered a point of procedure. To demand the formal inclusion of the King of Prussia was to ask what was impossible and, indeed, what was recognised as impossible by Pitt himself in the negotiations reopened later[1], namely that France should be guilty publicly of a breach of good faith, deprive herself of the alliance with Austria, and remain isolated in Europe without allies. In his efforts to extricate himself from his perplexities, Choiseul had pleaded the separation of the English from the continental war, but in order to succeed it was necessary to obtain in Pitt one who would be willing to meet him half way, who would—to use General Yorke's words—"help" the French "to a form of words which may read well" and enable them "to fly off from the Court of Vienna with...decency[2]," and who would consent to be a partaker in the pious fraud.

It is clear that there was very little chance of finding in Pitt the benevolent collaborator in the work of peace required. Pitt, indeed, had resolved upon the continuance of the war for at least another campaign. In the autumn of 1759, it is true, he appeared to be not disinclined to consider the possibility of peace[3], and he made a great point of the mention of the proposed Congress in the King's Speech of November[4]. In February 1760, in resisting the demand for troops for Germany, he declared "that if the King of Prussia was out of the question, was demolished, we should make a glorious peace. The House of Austria would be no longer our enemy. We should deal with France[5]."

But there can be little doubt that these appearances were deceptive, were far from representing Pitt's real intentions and, indeed, were adopted to conceal them. The Prussian envoys, who lived in confidential intercourse with Pitt, when advising the proposal of the Congress to Frederick, mentioned as advantages which would arise therefrom that the nation, believing peace to be near, would not refuse to support the burden of the continental war. Moreover, "un pareil événement disculperait aussi le Chevalier Pitt du reproche qu'on lui fait d'être le promoteur de la guerre[6]."

[1] Below, pp. 239–40, 268; H. 10, f. 9; Add. 6836, f. 137.

[2] Add. 6836, f. 139. [3] pp. 239–41; and see also H. 70, f. 45.

[4] *Chatham Corr.* i. 448; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 949.

[5] Stowe MSS. 263, f. 15 sqq.

[6] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xviii. 337, June 8, 1759. Other reasons for the step, given by the Prussian envoys, were that it would prevent all clandestine and hasty schemes of peace and the intrigues of the D. of N. against Pitt, which were endangering the alliance with Prussia. Frederick's envoys, however, had misunderstood the nature of the incident of the *Inconnue*; above, p. 24; and cf. Gen. Yorke to Mitchell with the K. of Prussia,

The project of the Congress was used by Pitt to crush other schemes, such as the Spanish mediation, rather than as a real attempt to secure peace. The attainment of the consent of all the Powers was extremely improbable. The determination of Austria and Russia to continue the hostilities was well known, and should their consent, contrary to expectations, be obtained, the proceedings would certainly be prolonged and probably end without result. Pitt did not enter seriously into the subsequent negotiation at the Hague. General Yorke was left without proper information or instructions[1], and to make failure more certain, Pitt insisted upon a condition, the inclusion of Prussia, to which it was obvious that France could not agree. At last, in April 1760, he declared openly to the Duke of Newcastle that another campaign was necessary and that "we did not want a peace[2]." "I have been told," writes Walpole, "he said that some time before he should have been well contented to bring France on her knees; now he would not rest till he had laid her on her back[3]."

In forming this fixed resolution to reject all projects of peace, Pitt appears to have been influenced both by public and private reasons. At the close of the campaigns of 1759, the British conquests from France were not consolidated or completed; and the motive which made Choiseul press the Spanish mediation and the negotiations at the Hague and reject the Congress, namely the anticipation of further disasters which delay would occasion[4], was also the inducement to Pitt to continue the war. Peace could only have been obtained by the sacrifice of a portion of the British acquisitions[5], and by a sacrifice at the same time of Pitt's popularity[6]. The closing of the war, Pitt had written to Lord Hardwicke, was as difficult a task as the sustaining it[7]. "Anybody could advise him in war," he had declared in the House of Commons at the opening of the new session, on October 13, 1759. "Who could draw such

January 29, 1760—"I know that false notions have been given to our ally [the K. of Prussia], as if some with us were intriguing separately; but those who gave the information serve him ill, because they make a false representation of our interior. The D. of N., Mr P. and my Father are perfectly well together and are incapable of any such thing. I mention this to prevent your being led astray and to enable you to set others right." Add. 6836, f. 136.

[1] For instance he was never informed officially of the action of Spain; p. 243; H. 10, f. 9; Add. 6836, f. 137.

[2] p. 244.

[3] *George II*, iii. 235–6.

[4] Choiseul's Mem. to Ossun, Waddington, iii. 440.

[5] p. 239.

[6] p. 245, and Schaefer, ii. *a*, 580 as above.

[7] p. 241.

a peace as would please everybody? He would snatch at the first moment of peace, though he wished he could leave off at the war."—"This conclusion," adds Walpole, "seemed to come from his heart and perhaps escaped him without design[1]." Pitt's reluctance or inability to consider the possibility of peace, however, had for some time been a source of anxiety to the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke. Pitt had declared, "No peace of Utrecht will again stain the annals of England[2]." Lord Hardwicke, without prescribing the acceptance of any actual terms or method of negotiation proposed by France, dwelt on the imprudence in general of waiting for the "very highest throw of the dice," of which a warning was afforded by the too hasty rejection of Louis XIV's terms at Gertruydenberg[3]. "Europe began to take umbrage at our success," writes Walpole, "but sailing with prosperity Mr Pitt did not trouble himself whether Europe's voice went along with his achievements[4]."

It is by no means certain, indeed, that the negotiations at the Hague or elsewhere, set on foot by France, would have produced a settlement adequate to the great sacrifices and conquests made by Great Britain, or would have produced any settlement at all. The total absence of agreement and harmony between the French ministers was a serious obstacle in itself to success. Their voice was uncertain, varying and hesitating, and inspired little confidence in the reality of their intentions. Moreover, if the anticipation of further British conquests made Pitt disinclined to peace, so the disasters to the Prussian army in 1759 rendered the French hopeful of better fortune in that quarter, and less disposed to retire defeated from the whole conflict.

In any case, however, a more temporising diplomacy, combined with an energetic support of the war, including Prince Ferdinand's operations, as Lord Hardwicke advised, would probably have proved advantageous to British interests, and would have warded off for a time, or perhaps wholly prevented, the final alliance formed by France and Spain against England[5].

While the negotiations between France and England had been in progress, the Spanish representations and half-veiled menaces had entirely ceased, and Charles III appeared to have abandoned

[1] *George II*, iii. 226.
[2] To Mitchell, June 12, 1759, Add. 6833, f. 10; *Chatham Corr.* i. 411.
[3] p. 239; H. 9, f. 221.
[4] *George II*, iii. 235–6; and see R. H. Soltau, *The Duke de Choiseul*, pp. 41–7.
[5] p. 242.

his attitude of fear and jealousy of England. On December 13, 1759, on his arrival in Spain, he had written to the King in terms of marked friendliness[1]. The same month, he had disavowed and recalled Abreu, his minister in London[2]. On January 1, 1760, General Yorke wrote that the Spanish minister at the Hague had assured him that they had no intention of meddling, and had no complaint or ill-will against England[3]. In March and May, he wrote again to the same effect[4]. On May 10, Choiseul expressed great disappointment at the small support now accorded by Spain to the French cause[5]. The final failure of the negotiations with England, however, brought the two Powers again into closer union, and in June 1760, the King of Spain renewed his former attitude of hostility. On June 20, Fuentes, the new Spanish ambassador in London, forwarded to Pitt a violent memorandum complaining of insults, and of injustice committed by the English Courts. On September 9, he forwarded further complaints on the subject of the British encroachments in Honduras and the cutting of logwood, and laid claims to the Newfoundland fisheries. Moreover, it was declared that a copy of the memorandum had been communicated to France, which drew a dignified verbal remonstrance from Pitt on September 16[6]; while, on September 26, he forwarded a despatch to Lord Bristol, the British ambassador at Madrid, to be shown confidentially to Wall, in which any concession on the subject of the Newfoundland fisheries was absolutely refused. The right to cut logwood, guaranteed in the Treaty of Utrecht, could not be given up; but the ministers were prepared to negotiate an arrangement more convenient to the Spanish Court, while they were ready to give satisfaction concerning the forts and settlements, on which point the British case did not stand so firmly. The diplomatic methods of the Spanish Court met with a severe rebuke and especially the attempt, by the communication of the memorandum to the French Court, to "intimidate," but which could only "indispose," the King of England. Should the Spanish Court adhere to its memorials, the King's answer could only be such as the dignity of his crown and the interests of his subjects demanded.

[1] Chatham MSS. 92.

[2] *Chatham Corr.* ii. 22, 46; Choiseul's Mem. printed by Soulange-Bodin in *Le Pacte de Famille*, 241–2; A. Bourguet, *Le Duc de Choiseul et l'Alliance Espagnole*, 110 sqq.

[3] H. 17, f. 88.

[4] J. Y. to Holderness, March 7, 1760. R. O., St. Pap., Holland; H. 17, f. 120.

[5] Waddington, iii. 544.

[6] p. 250 *n.*; printed in *Chat. Corr.* ii. 69.

At the same time, the King's sincere desire to settle the dispute and to maintain the friendship with Spain was affirmed[1]. Lord Hardwicke, in spite of his desire for peace, expressed to Pitt his entire approval of his despatch and of his reply to Fuentes. Such was the issue of the various negotiations which had been entered upon for the conclusion of hostilities. Peace with France was not secured. War with Spain was almost assured.

The new session, in the autumn of 1759, was opened by Pitt who announced that "he had unlearned his juvenile errors and thought no longer that England could do all by itself." Fifteen and a half millions were voted for carrying on the war, which included the subsidy of £670,000 for the King of Prussia and the maintenance of 70,000 seamen, 57,290 British land troops, 38,750 Hanoverians and Germans, the garrisons abroad, and regiments fighting in America and the militia, which amounted altogether, according to Walpole, to 175,000 men[2].

The new year 1760 saw the consolidation of the British conquests in Canada, but not without some reverses. General Murray was defeated by the French on April 28, and was obliged to retire within the walls of Quebec, which might have fallen once more into the hands of the enemy but for the arrival of the British ships, which scattered the French fleet. But this was followed by a combined movement of the forces against the French, who capitulated to Amherst, on September 8, at Montreal, and abandoned finally the whole of Canada[3], Louisiana alone in America remaining French territory. Almost at the same time, a French fleet, sent to the relief of Montreal, was destroyed by Lord Byron. Another French expedition, consisting of three ships and 600 men, which landed in Ireland and took Carrickfergus, was completely annihilated early in March. In India the power of France was finally overthrown at the battle of Wandiwash, won by Coote on January 22. In February, the last possession of France on the coast was taken and every vestige of French dominion in India disappeared, Pondicherry falling on January 6, 1761.

In Germany, Prince Ferdinand and his nephew, the Hereditary Prince, were hampered by a lamentable inferiority of forces, occasioned by the withdrawal of troops for the support of Frederick and by the refusal at first of Pitt, now intent upon his new project against Belleisle, and who affected fears of an invasion and of the

[1] For Pitt's correspondence see Thackeray's *Chatham*, i. and ii. app.
[2] *George II*, iii. 234.
[3] p. 247.

risk of depending upon the militia, to despatch reinforcements. Nor was this inferiority entirely repaired by the tardy arrival of a British force later[1].

The Hereditary Prince was defeated at Corbach, on July 10, but gained a success at Emsdorf, and Prince Ferdinand won a more decisive action at Warburg on July 31. A defeat of the Hereditary Prince's forces at Campen on October 16, the consequent loss of Wesel and an unsuccessful attempt to retake Göttingen by Prince Ferdinand, closed this campaign without any striking advantages on either side. But the French had been prevented from joining their allies, the Russians and the Austrians, and from overwhelming the King of Prussia.

The latter had again this year been severely pressed, but succeeded in beating off his enemies. After a campaign of failure in Saxony, in which the chief incidents were a defeat of Fouquet, one of his generals, at Landshut, on June 23, the loss of Glatz and the useless bombardment of Dresden, he marched into Silesia, won the battle of Liegnitz over the Austrians, on August 15, and then returning again to Saxony, gained the great victory of Torgau, on November 3, over the same foe, against vastly superior numbers, one of the fiercest struggles of the whole war. Meanwhile, Berlin itself had fallen a prey to the Russians and Austrians, on October 9, but the capital was quickly evacuated on the approach of Frederick. The campaign ended with the expulsion of the enemy by these successful operations from Silesia, and, with the exception of Dresden, from Saxony.

The full tide of British glory and success continued to roll on without a check. In every part of the globe the enemy had been humbled and defeated. With exhausted resources, with their navy extinguished and a weak, divided and disorganised government, the French were deprived of every hope of retrieving past errors or of regaining their lost predominance in the world; while in England, the national prosperity had rather increased than diminished during the war, and the Cabinet had become by the lapse of time, and by the great successes achieved, only more firmly knit together and more united in policy.

The Duke of Newcastle and Pitt, notwithstanding some rubs, were on terms not only friendly but affectionate[2], and Lord Shelburne writes that Pitt, looking back with regret from the

[1] Stowe MSS. 263, f. 15, February 18, 1760; p. 245.

[2] See the Duke's letters to Pitt, *e.g.* Chatham MSS. 51, May 24, 1760.

unhappiness and confusion of the next reign, told him that the meetings of the ministers "were the most agreeable conversations he ever experienced[1]." The same spirit of co-operation existed between the ministers and the chiefs of the army and navy, and again between these and the officers chosen to carry out their orders. Instead of obstructions and jealousies between the two services, a full union and harmony of action had developed, of which the culminating instance had been the conquest of Quebec. Moreover, the ministers received the steady support of the King, the Parliament and the people. With the exception of Leicester House, all factions had been silenced. The whole energy of the people was concentrated on the great struggle for empire, and the co-operation of all the various classes and forces of the nation had never been more complete than at this moment. There was now only wanting to complete the great work, a great peace, in which should be embodied and secured the national triumphs and acquisitions; and this also, judging from the overwhelming strength of her power, seemed well within the grasp of Britain.

In these circumstances, the death of the King, which took place very suddenly in the early morning of October 25[2], came as a grievous national misfortune. His character has been described to us by many contemporaries in realistic colours and by many historians[3], and his strong personality has often impressed itself upon these pages. He had undoubtedly great defects, an avarice which was often ridiculous, a violent temper which, allowed to develope unchecked, was increased in old age, a want of self-control and of reserve, an uncultured, rather than an inferior intellect, and some coarse vices. But with all this there was a courage, a fidelity, and a strict sense of honour, a depth, solidity and steadiness of character, which inspired respect and trust and even affection. His ministers often found him intractable, but there was never that loss of confidence between the sovereign and his servants which was such a painful and dangerous feature in public life in the new reign. He gave firm support to his generals in their campaign and knew how to keep their secrets[4]. He never abused the confidence placed in him by his ministers. He was regular and punctual in his habits. He had a high conception

[1] *Life*, by Lord Fitzmaurice, i. 85.

[2] pp. 253 sqq.

[3] Lecky (1883), ii. 519; Smollett, Lord Chesterfield, Lord Waldegrave. It is impossible to add Lord Hervey as an authority or Horace Walpole (*George II*, i. 175).

[4] p. 234; Walpole's *George II*, iii. 190.

of the dignity and responsible duties of kingship. "Constitutionally brave, he loved and cherished that virtue in others[1]." He possessed that great and kingly quality of openness, truthfulness and sincerity which, it is well known, was also a particular characteristic of the late revered Queen Victoria. "The late good old King," said Pitt generously, "had something of humanity and, amongst many other royal and manly virtues, he possessed justice, truth and sincerity, in an eminent degree, so that he had something about him by which it was possible for you to know whether he liked you or disliked you[2]." "He was good-natured and sincere," writes Lord Charlemont. "He always was what he appeared to be. He might offend but he never deceived[3]." Like Sir Robert Walpole, if his acquaintance with books was small, his shrewd and pointed remarks show that he knew men. He had the royal quality of recognising true merit and greatness and of detecting and punishing criminal lapses from public duty, such as those of Byng and Sackville. His passionate affection for the land of his birth, however injudiciously indulged in, and however injurious it may have proved to British interests, was a worthy element in his character, and one which cannot be ridiculed or despised by any who are conscious of similar feelings for their own native land; and the exercise of greater tact and discretion on the part of some of his ministers would probably have obviated many of the disadvantages and inconveniences which resulted from it. His strong dislike of Pitt, at least, was fully justified by the minister's ill-bred, wounding and imprudent reflections upon the Electorate. As a German Prince he was accustomed to absolute rule and military obedience in his little country, and it can scarcely be a matter of surprise that his experience of English administration, of the intrigues of parties and of the corruption and self-seeking of pretended patriots, created in him no enthusiasm for parliamentary government. Nevertheless, he acquired and practised the difficult, and at that time, the new art of governing as a constitutional sovereign in England, and arbitrary and despotic in his disposition, he yet subordinated on several occasions, though not without explosions of wrath, his personal wishes to political necessities. "I have known few persons of high rank," says Lord Waldegrave, "who could bear contradiction better, provided the intention was apparently good and the manner

[1] Lord Charlemont *ut infra*.
[2] *Parl. Hist.* xvi. 849 and Lord Waldegrave's *Memoirs*, 4 sqq.
[3] *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Lord Charlemont, i. 13.

decent." A genuine spirit of liberty, moderation and toleration was fostered under his rule. "With him our laws and liberties were safe," writes an enlightened contemporary, Mrs Elizabeth Montague. "He possessed in a great degree the confidence of his people and the respect of foreign governments; and a certain steadiness of character made him of great consequence in these unsettled times....His character would not afford subject for Epic poetry but will look well in the sober page of history[1]."

An immense advance was made in his long reign, and largely owing to his scrupulous respect for English liberties, in constitutional government, in the developement of law and administration of justice, in religious and political toleration and in the happiness and undisturbed prosperity of all classes. Great national perils were sturdily encountered and overcome. Great problems of statesmanship and policy were solved with courage and firmness. Scotland was united with England. The dangerous predominance of France was destroyed. The empire was won to Britain, and it was not unfitting that the last British sovereign to lead his troops to battle should disappear from the scene amidst a blaze of military glory. "He died in the height of his glory," wrote General Yorke, "loved, honoured and respected by all Europe[2]."

It was not, however, till after the death of the old King, that the value of his strong personality and of his capacity for government was thoroughly understood and realised[3]. The misfortunes and confusion consequent upon his disappearance from the scene give the measure of the great services he was rendering to the nation. "During his long reign," continues Mrs Montague, "we never were subject to the insolence and rapaciousness of favourites. ...If we consider only the evils we have avoided during his late Majesty's reign, we shall find abundant matter of gratitude towards him and respect for his memory[4]."

Burke, writing from the gloom and shadow of the next reign, on the cause of the present discontents, extends this eulogy still further. "He carried the glory, the power, the commerce of England to a height unknown...and he left his succession resting

[1] *Correspondence*, by E. J. Climenson, ii. 210. [2] H. 17, f. 230.

[3] Thus Frederick, with less than his usual sagacity, writes to Finkenstein, November 7, 1760, "C'est un malheur, mais pas aussi grand qu'il le paraît pour nos affaires, et pour mieux dire, je crois que nous n'y perdrons rien par de certaines considérations relatives aux préjugés du défunt pour son Électorat." *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xx. 61. He had soon reason to change his mind.

[4] *Ut supra.*

on the true and only true foundations of all national and all regal greatness; affection at home, reputation abroad, trust in allies, terror in rival nations. The most ardent lover of his country cannot wish for Great Britain a happier fate than to continue as she was then left. A people, emulous as we are in affection to our present sovereign, know not how to form a prayer to heaven for a greater blessing upon his virtues or a higher state of felicity and glory, than that he should live and should reign, and when Providence ordains it, should die, exactly like his illustrious predecessor[1]."

This language, natural and sincere in the writer, in whose mind the glories of the past were enhanced and magnified by the calamities and humiliations of the present, appears now perhaps exaggerated. But looking back with a more extended prospect and with a juster perspective than was possible for Burke, we can still join in Lord Waldegrave's "thorough conviction" that George II "will be numbered amongst those patriot Kings, under whose government the people have enjoyed the greatest happiness," and whose name, amongst the long succession of great sovereigns of this country, will stand well in the Chronicle.

CORRESPONDENCE

[The Duke of Newcastle had, by the King's desire, written to Colonel Yorke on July 8, 1757 (N. 187, ff. 152–4), to inform him of the political situation and to ask his opinion as to the measures to be taken for carrying on the war.]

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 187, f. 200; H. 89, f. 15.] HAGUE, *July 15th*, 1757.

...The great object of the nation is the American war, which may be said to be thoroughly attended to, if we have sent thither a body of troops superior in number to the regulars which the French have in those parts: and secondly, if we have a marine force there able to protect their operations. The rest depends upon the conduct of the officers who command and upon the blessing of Providence; for ministers can only furnish the means, not decide the success.

The probability of succeeding in our main point is, however, much increased by the part the French take in the affairs of Germany, which turns their attention, as well as their money, from their marine, and...making expeditions to our Colonies. The

[1] *Thoughts on the Present Discontents* (*Works* (1852), iii. 124).

diversion is at the same time only temporary, and if they can carry their point in Germany, they will return with double vigour to fall upon us both by land and sea. It seems therefore necessary for us to try some means to stop the progress of the French arms against the King of Prussia, and to prevent them forcing him to accept next winter such a peace as they would prescribe, and would leave them at liberty to turn their whole force against us.

[As far as he could see, this could only be done by reinforcing the Duke of Cumberland's army, either by German Protestant soldiers, who would probably be easily secured now, or by English. To the objection of the expense of the latter he was not insensible, but it should be considered whether the "diversion given to France by obliging her to keep 100,000 or 150,000 men in Germany" was not worth it. France was ruining herself by these continental campaigns. For one year, from October 1, 1756, to October 1, 1757, her expenses were estimated by the financiers as more than £20,000,000[1]; and to keep her one year more at this expenditure would be a great stroke. A union among the German Protestant Princes with the King of Prussia at their head was what France feared more than anything, and which should be strongly supported by Great Britain. England would indeed be thus involved in the continental war, but only as an auxiliary, not as a principal, with the object of securing a free hand in America and having a voice in the settlement at the conclusion of the peace. As to Holland, their participation must be left to themselves, and to the issue and events of the campaign[2].]

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 153.] HAGUE, *July 15th*, 1757.

MY LORD,

...His Prussian Majesty works night and day, and as he has had a smart lesson of prudence he will, I believe, go more surely to work another time. I have by indirect channels conveyed to him the necessity of informing and encouraging us, as well as sending a digested, reasonable plan for our future and concerted operations. I think he will see that the King has now a Ministry that can and will do business. This will do us good everywhere; the opposite situation has lost us more ground in Europe than the Prussians have lost since the battle of the 18th June....Your Lordship may depend upon the bent of the nation [the Dutch][3]. It is not a chimaera, and you would be convinced it is not if you was to be here only eight days. We must have, however, a little more

[1] *I.e.* her whole (including her ordinary) expenditure, which was 10 or 11 millions. H. 9, f. 158.

[2] The D. of N. expressed disappointment at this letter as wanting in precision. (N. 187, ff. 285, 300.)

[3] *I.e.* against France. H. 9, f. 147.

time and if, in the meanwhile, you can restore two or three insignificant vessels with some parade, it will be productive of much good; and even an order in the *Gazette* to privateers to act with circumspection and humanity under the ordinary penalties would operate greatly in our favour. These are trifles in appearance, but they are the trifles that make France succeed where we fail....May I ask under the rose why no augmentations are made in the Hanoverian troops, or amongst the other Princes of Lower Saxony? No way is so natural to reinforce that army [of the Duke of Cumberland] as such a measure. The men are there, are willing, are Protestants and hate the French. All those Princes have large bodies of militia and will they patiently see, for want of giving orders or taking measures, their countries pillaged and their revenues lost? This puzzles me and embarrasses me....

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 157.] HAGUE, *July 19th*, 1757.

MY LORD,...

I mentioned in my last that much depended upon the firmness and resolution at Hanover. Without that, all our expense upon the continent is thrown away, and you must never expect to hold the King of Prussia in a reverse of fortune. I don't say this from any suspicion founded upon anything else than my private opinion and apprehension; but as it is publicly said everywhere that a neutrality is still negotiating for the Electorate, which is not authentically contradicted, it throws such a damp upon our friends, especially in this country, that one cannot expect to awaken them to anything....I thought it my duty to say so much to your Lordship, as it is not a fit subject for a despatch....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 187, f. 300.] WREST, *July 22nd*, 1757.

...It is a great instance of weakness, as well as of ambition, that our friend, Mr Legge, should have such a hankering after the Admiralty. However, I am very glad he has changed his language about Lord Anson[1]; for before, his discourse was very extraordinary and not agreeable to the friendship which he used to profess. As to the "inadvertences and mistakes in manner etc." which he flings out, I have taken a great deal of care to get them

[1] Legge had now allowed in common with the general consensus of opinion, that Lord Anson, "could he get the better of some little inadvertences and mistakes in manner etc., was the most proper person" for the control of the Admiralty. N. 187, f. 285.

rectified, and think I have succeeded[1]. The testimony of Hunter[2] and Hay[3] I look upon as extorted by the force of truth; for I verily believe it to be true that in their former time they hardly knew what they were about. My Lord Temple himself (when I wished him joy of the Privy Seal) expressed great satisfaction in not returning to his former office, and was so candid as to own to me that he found it the most uneasy situation that a man could possibly be in; for he was obliged to be continually turning, first to one Admiral and then to another, to get explanations of the common terms and forms. I suppose this was the chief reason of their sitting so early and so late, as we were told at the time.

[The tidings from abroad appeared to him as bad as possible, and alarmed him exceedingly.] God send us better news than there is reason to augur from all these circumstances! But all of them put together unite to make one pray for an end of this unequal, cruel, destructive war. For God's sake, let us push for a peace, and all channels be tried for it with discretion; for I look upon this nation as upon the brink of ruin, brought on by objects, at first of little consequence, but improved by factions, as well in the court as in the country....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 187, f. 426; H. 69, f. 7.]

NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *August 3rd*, 1757, at night.

MY DEAR LORD,

The fate of Hanover is now decided; the Duke's army was beat on the 26th of last month and His Royal Highness is retired to Nienburg, which leads to Bremen and Stade. The country of Hanover etc. is open to the French, and I understand by the King that the President Münchausen[4] was to have a conference with the Marshal D'Estrées[5]. I yet know few particulars. The first authentic account I had was early this morning by the

[1] Lord Anson was reserved in manner, inaccessible to solicitations, and had a great dislike to correspondence.

[2] Thomas Orby Hunter, a lord of the Admiralty.

[3] George Hay (1715–1778), vicar-general to the Archbishop of Canterbury and a lord of the Admiralty 1756; M.P. for Calne, later Dean of the Arches and knighted.

[4] Gerlach Adolf, Baron v. Münchausen (1688–1770), Hanoverian minister and founder of Göttingen University. His younger brother, Philip Adolf, was Hanoverian Minister in London.

[5] Louis César, Comte D'Estrées, maréchal de France (1695–1771), commander-in-chief of the French forces in Germany, but superseded immediately after the battle of Hastenbeck by the Duc de Richelieu.

enclosed letter[1]. I found the King calm but determined. The Duke had not wrote, but had dispatched M. Behr, one of the Hanover Ministers, who was in the action, to Hanover, to send the account of what had passed. The battle, or rather skirmish, lasted three days; the two first we had greatly the advantage, but M. D'Estrées was reinforced (as they say) by 20,000 men, and that overpowered our army. The loss (that is our loss) is inconsiderable, not above 600 men. The stress of the action fell upon the left wing, composed of the Hessians and the Wolfenbuttle troops, which behaved extremely well, and the young Prince of Wolfenbuttle[2] led on his father's troops with great courage etc. The King has lost in men only one Major General and about 50 men, but the whole country will be soon in the French hands. Hanover is before this time. His Majesty was calm, said, "He must do the best he could: he had stood it as long as he could and he must get out of it as well as he could, that he had taken his part"—which I found was to make his peace,—"that he would take the best care he could of the Landgrave of Hesse, the Dukes of [Brunswick-] Wolfenbuttle and Gotha." I just mentioned the King of Prussia; the King said, "He could do nothing more for him; that he would acquaint His Prussian Majesty with what he should be necessitated to do, and that, if *we here* would do anything further for the King of Prussia, he should have no objection to it." I thought when I could offer nothing for the King's support it would be very improper for me to say anything against any measures His Majesty should take for his own security. I afterwards met my Lord President, my Lord Holderness and Mr Pitt. I acquainted them with what the King had said. They all thought *we* could give no advice about the intended neutrality. I told them I only meant to know whether anything could be proposed by us, that might induce the King still to stand out. I found nothing could be done. The sending troops now was thought hazardous and useless, and no great use was to be had from money, if it could be offered. Mr Pitt was much alarmed at the effect this would have upon the King of Prussia, and declared his opinion that *we* should forthwith send him most large offers of money in order to engage him to continue in his present system, and not to make peace, or at least not to give him a pretence to say that he is abandoned by England. That is certainly very right. But when the King has made his peace as Elector (if he can do it), and has also included the Landgrave of Hesse and the Dukes of Wolfenbuttle and Gotha, it will be impossible for the King of Prussia, attacked on all sides, to stand out alone. The army of observation, which will be now dissolved, was the only barrier for the King of Prussia's country on that side. He will certainly endeavour to make his peace, perhaps at the expense of the King, both as King and Elector, and it was

[1] From Münchausen, N. 187, f. 431.

[2] *I.e.* Charles William Ferdinand, the Hereditary Prince, afterwards Duke of Brunswick.

to avoid that that your Lordship and I were for sending troops from hence. But that would have been too late, if it had been agreed to by others, and is now out of the question. I just dropped to the King that his Majesty had yet no account from the Duke, and did not know his Royal Highness's situation or intention. And though I think the King will not change his present measure, yet nothing will be sent away till the Duke's letters arrive.

I say to your Lordship, *in the utmost confidence*, I am not sure whether, in the situation things are in *here* at present, this cause or necessity for making a neutrality is so much disliked. To be sure the loss has been inconsiderable.

Alone, absolutely alone as I am in Council, I must upon all occasions apply to your Lordship. Can *we* say anything against this neutrality? Can we offer the King any adequate assistance to induce his Majesty to stand out? Or what will be the consequence if the King does persist in it? The only comfort your Lordship and I can have (if we can have any), is that no part of this misfortune, or of any that may happen in America, can be imputed to us. Hanover is gone, to the reproach of this nation. If the King can yet save it or get it again, I don't see how we can prevent it. The King was, I said, very calm this day, though very much the contrary yesterday, and I did not find that Mr Pitt had given the least satisfaction on Monday.

[He had had a long and friendly conversation with Pitt who adhered to his own plan, but was prepared next year to give as much as £1,200,000 for the continent, including £400,000 to the King, as Elector, and £300,000 for the Hessians; but this was next year, not now. The admirals and generals had now been satisfied that the expedition to France was practicable, and it was to take place.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 187, f. 441.] WIMPOLE, Thursday, *Aug. 4th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,

At a little before eight this morning I received the honour of your Grace's despatch by Mytton, which has filled my mind with the greatest uneasiness. At the same time, I cannot say that I understand, either what the fact is, or the circumstances accompanying the account. That there should have been a general action between the two armies, and the Duke send no account of it to the King, but trust to the verbal relation of Mon. Rehn (so I read his name) [*i.e.* Behr] to the Hanover minister, and to their more uncertain report of it at second hand, is to me very extraordinary. But it is still more incomprehensible that two such great armies should fight for three days together and the loss

on the beaten side be no more than 600 men, and that of the Hanoverian troops (near two-thirds of the whole) about 50 men. These things want clearing up and, I presume, will be cleared, when the letters from His R. Highness arrive. A reinforcement of 20,000 men coming in upon the third day is a prodigious one.... As your Grace, my Lord President, Lord Holderness and Mr Pitt all thought you could give no advice about the supposed neutrality, I am sure I am incapable of it, and, indeed, the not being able to furnish the King with any assistance of any kind from hence is an unanswerable objection against an English minister's pretending to give advice in such a case. Your Grace knows that I was early of opinion to have sent troops from hence, and so were you....As to the neutrality, I conjecture that it is partly over, whilst we are deliberating about it, as the battle was, whilst we were deliberating about strengthening the army of observation last Tuesday sevennight; for I cannot help supposing that it will probably be settled or near it, in some shape or other, at the conference between the President Münchausen and M. D'Estrées.

As to the King of Prussia, my poor opinion is that he will make his peace if possible. I agree with Mr Pitt that we should encourage him to hold out as much as possible, by as large an assistance of money as reasonably may be; and I am glad to find that he is in a disposition to be so generous, both to the King and His Prussian Majesty. But all this comes excessively late; and your Grace's observation is certainly most just, that if the King makes either a peace or neutrality as Elector and includes therein the Landgrave of Hesse and the Dukes of Wolfenbuttle and Saxe Gotha, His Prussian Majesty will be left absolutely alone....It is certainly right that nothing should be sent from hence by way of advice or information till the Duke's own account comes. I shall be curious to know what *pourparlers* there had been, or steps taken, towards a treaty of neutrality before this action happened.

I own I don't understand the postponing all considerations of assistance either in money or otherwise, 'till another year, for I apprehend that the King of Prussia will have made his peace, such as he can, and the whole will be over upon the Continent this year.

I am glad that the generals and admirals have received such entire satisfaction, about the expedition; though I am so heart-broken that I cannot entertain any hopes from it. Considering that the King of Prussia once demanded this, and we have so

great an army unemployed, I think it cannot now be laid aside; but it comes so late that great part of its use, even as a diversion, is lost....

I am, my dear Lord,

Ever unalterably yours,

HARDWICKE.

[On August 6, 1757 (N. 187, f. 465; H. 63, f. 277), the Duke writes again to Lord Hardwicke on the unfortunate project for the neutrality of Hanover on which the King is quite resolved and further details of which, the Duke hints, will confirm Lord Hardwicke's suspicions that it was a scheme *not quite new*. The King expected, even in the case of this peace, some indemnification which, the Duke of Newcastle told Lady Yarmouth, could not possibly be granted.]

The King told me he could be of no further use *to us*; that he had done his best and that "necessity had no law"; and that was what he would say to the King of Prussia.

[The Duke saw the worst possible consequences from this step —the King of Prussia would be either quite destroyed, or else rendered an implacable and eternal enemy to Britain. Mr Pitt was of the same opinion, but would do nothing on the ground that nothing adequate could be done, and that any proposal would be construed as "advice against the measure." The Princess Amelia was frightened out of her wits, and had begged the Duke to send some ships to the Elbe to save her brother. Lord Hardwicke is to advise the Duke what "he would have him do upon the whole."]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 187, f. 478; H. 69, f. 15.] Secret.

WIMPOLE, *August 7th*, 1757, Sunday night.

MY DEAR LORD,

I received the honour of your Grace's despatch by Evans this forenoon, and have ever since been deliberating what to say upon it. You desire to know my poor thoughts, what should be done upon the whole and "hope it is not too much to ask." It is certainly not too much for your Grace to command of me, and if I knew how to form an opinion I should be very ready to communicate it to you; for though there is some delicacy in putting opinions on subjects of this nature into writing, yet that cannot take place between me and your Grace, towards whom I have no reserve. But there is one preliminary difficulty in the present case, which is fundamental. The opinions of the King's English servants

seem to me to be asked as if you were to ask the opinion of your lawyer or physician, without fully stating your case to them; for I do not find that you are yet authentically informed, either of the circumstances leading to a treaty, previous to the late action upon the Weser, or of the loss, circumstances or consequences of that action. Is it not very strange that there have been hitherto no letters from the army? [Peace is certainly to be wished for but not a divided one, the Elector first making his terms and leaving England to make a subsequent separate settlement, which would be most disadvantageous. At the same time, it was difficult to see how any English minister could oppose the projected neutrality for Hanover, unless he could guarantee to the King adequate assistance. In any case, it was much to be wished that the neutrality might be delayed, at least till the present campaign was over. The King should communicate frankly his necessities and his intentions to the King of Prussia. He is glad that the Duke has had a proper discourse with Pitt on the subject, and found him reasonable; they should agree together on some sum to be offered to the King immediately which would, at least, be useful in moderating the King's anxiety and eagerness, and prevent him running into any hasty ill-considered measure. He is more afraid of a French invasion than some of the Duke's colleagues, and is glad the expedition is to return to England before the end of September.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 187, f. 492; H. 69, f. 23.]

NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *August 9th*, 1757, at night.

[Thanks him for his letter and advice which has been taken and acted upon, as far as the present would permit. Mr Pitt had much pleased the King, had offered him £100,000 and also a grant to the Landgrave of Hesse in his retreat at Hamburg.] Mr Pitt... said, since we could do nothing in the North, we must see what could be done in the South; that for that reason we should endeavour to get Spain, not only by putting an end to all our maritime and commercial disputes, but also by doing something solid for Spain; and then proposed the offering Gibraltar to Spain, if they would help us to Port Mahon, for without Port Mahon nobody would *venture* to make peace; that in return for Gibraltar we might have Oran or some port on the Barbary Coast. Your Lordship knows that this exchange for Gibraltar is not a new thought. Münchausen mentioned it some time ago to the King; I also had some discourse to His Majesty upon it. I own I always liked it, and therefore I gave much into it. I believe Pitt has been

talking to Count Viry[1] upon it. Mr Pitt desired that it might seriously be considered by the King's servants; that if this did not do, he was ready *to do anything*, by which I thought he meant to make such peace as we could get*. He talked also about Denmark, the whole tending to do something. He desired particularly that your Lordship might be sent for; and it was afterwards agreed to desire that your Lordship, the Duke of Devonshire and the Duke of Bedford would come to town to meet at Lord Holderness's house on Wednesday evening, the 17th inst., to consider what may be proper to do in the present distressed state of affairs....I hope your Lordship will not fail us. There never was a time when honest and able advice was more wanted, and I really think you will find *some people* more disposed to take it than I could have imagined. One instance is remarkable and goes to the *fond* of affairs. After we had agreed upon the *minute*....I asked him what I must say to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Jemmy Grenville[2]. He said—" As to J. Grenville, I take that upon me. Bring the warrant to-morrow. Don't delay one moment, and then send it down to the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a measure agreed upon between us. He will be prepared for it, for on our return the other night from Grocers Hall, I told the Chancellor of the Exchequer that *that* was great honour to us, but that we must do what was right and I began to see the situation of affairs was such, that the King would stand in need of some immediate assistance, and that therefore we must depart from the rigidness of our declarations. To which Mr Legge assented."—This I call the *fond* of the affair, and to be sure promises well. I know your Lordship is apt to think things make strong impressions upon me; they do, when I think them material. I have reserved for the last what your Lordship may think the most material. There are two messengers come from the Duke....The Duke is retiring still further towards Stade. Lady Yarmouth is violently against the separate peace, for the King's honour, and my honest friend Münchausen as strongly for it. Pitt reasons, as we all do, that this immediate supply may enable the King to subsist his army and consequently prevent his precipitating matters. The King of Prussia is retiring towards Saxony....The King of Prussia is highly pleased with our offer of a subsidy but will not be any charge to us, except he shall find himself in a condition to do something....The King will ask the Duke's opinion whether he can support himself, before he takes any step towards his separate peace....

KENSINGTON, *August* 10*th*, 1757.

P.S. This day the King showed me a letter to His Majesty from the Duke, representing in the strongest terms, the desperate

[1] The Sardinian minister and a mutual friend of Pitt, Newcastle and Lord Bute.

* When Mr Fox was for giving up Gibraltar [above, vol. ii. 305] the D. of N. did not see the proposition in so favourable a light; indeed affairs abroad were worse at this time.

[2] James Grenville (1715–1783), a Lord of the Treasury, brother of Lord Temple and George Grenville, and brother-in-law of Pitt.

condition of his army, retiring to Stade where they could not winter, and where the enemy might pursue them, whose view now was plainly the destruction of the King's army; that he thought it his duty to submit this to the King and whatever orders His Majesty should send him, His R. Highness and the army under his command would cheerfully obey. The King was much touched with the letter, and said he would send an order to the Duke to stop the French by offering to treat and that he would, or had acquainted, the King of Prussia with what "he was obliged to do."...

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 169.] HAGUE, *August 9th*, 1757.

...The troops, it is agreed by foes and friends, did incomparably well, and are certainly animated with the true spirit of men fighting for their country, which makes it a little wondered at that they were carried so soon from the enemy, especially as their General himself says they retired with discontent, and the French say as much as that they were beat. The next subject of wonder is how the army came to take the route it has, instead of going into the country of Hildesheim, where it might have covered Hanover and Brunswick and kept open a communication with the King of Prussia, whilst the French would have been kept back to the mountains and deprived of all the forage, contributions and carriages they are now in possession of[1]....I know nothing of H.R.H.'s plan. I write constantly and he answers very graciously, but no confidence, nor do my friends about him care to speak out. I believe he is neither in good health nor good humour....I know further that the Duke of Brunswick has left the army very much discontented....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 188, f. 24.] WIMPOLE, *Aug. 11th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I was indeed in hopes that I had gone through points enough to have secured me from a summons to town for some time longer, and am sorry to find that I augur'd wrong. However, I will, if I am well, certainly obey your commands in substance, though I cannot do it as to the precise day. [He cannot come till Thursday.]

It gives me great pleasure that your Grace has found Mr Pitt in so good a disposition, and I have great hopes that you will go on upon this foot. In times of such difficulty and distress, I think

[1] See H. 9, f. 177, where these points are further developed.

Mr Pitt will see the necessity of it. The King will also find his convenience in receiving the tenders of his service in the manner he has done upon the occasion your Grace mentions. His Majesty will be better served by putting those who serve him in good humour than into bad. I was convinced that the advancing of a sum of money to the King in the present exigency was right and necessary, and I am glad it was so readily complied with. The present to the Landgrave of Hesse, though no great matter, I also think very right in his present circumstances; but I have a notion that Mr Pitt had a particular view in it. I firmly believe neither of these could have been ventured upon, if the administration had been formed under Mr Fox, as was projected[1].

I am very glad that the method and terms of making a general peace begin to be seriously thought of. It is a labyrinth in which, whenever I think upon it, I am lost. The exchange of Gibraltar for Minorca may be right, for ought I know; for I have formed no opinion about it. But to that you must have the consent of France as well as of Spain; and Spain will consequently owe the obligation of the restitution of Gibraltar to that crown. Mr Pitt says that without Minorca nobody will venture to make a peace. But is he sure that as much popular clamour will not arise from giving up Gibraltar for Port Mahon, which will be a new voluntary act, as from letting those possessions remain where the fortune of the war has cast them? But I admit that clamour must not govern measures in this great and dangerous crisis; and if the one or the other becomes necessary, the different importance of the two places to Great Britain must be the rule to go by.'

I have read over the relation of the battle, skirmish or cannonading—call it what you please. I suppose it is owing to my unmilitary head, but I own I do not understand it. It does not appear how far the armies were engaged, nor is there any account of the killed and wounded, even on our own side, although so much time had passed as from the 26th of July to the 2nd of August.

The Duke's representation in his letter to the King is very different from Mr. Münchausen's, in his letter to your Grace.... His Majesty will certainly be in the right to ask the Duke's opinion "whether he can support himself or not." To endeavour to stop

[1] Because of the national outcry, always raised against such subsidies which would probably have been led by Pitt, if in opposition. Hence the enormous advantage of the inclusion of Pitt in the ministry.

the French by offering to treat in the field looks like surrendering at discretion.

[Both the King and the Duke of Cumberland should communicate with the King of Prussia before making the separate peace.]

[On August 12, 1757 (H. 16, f. 263), Col. Yorke writes a long letter to Lord Royston on the bad situation abroad, consequent on the failure of the King of Prussia's campaign in Bohemia, and continues] To add to the misfortune of this situation too, I am always apprehensive that the conduct of the Duke since the action of the 26th past (in which I see now very clearly the enemy was beat, tho' we retired), will occasion a total dissolution of the little remains of a system we still had upon the Continent, and which, with good management, might still have made head against the French, and perhaps have preserved the greatest and best part of the King's German dominions. With what view that army has taken the route it has down the Weser, I cannot to this minute conceive; for I see a thousand strong reasons against it...and not one plausible one for it; as the covering of Stade and keeping a communication open with England are not sufficient to counterbalance the other [*i.e.* retiring so as to cover Hanover and Brunswick and keep open communications with the King of Prussia]. I have always been afraid that our starving the cause in this campaign would enable France to make short work...[Complains that no notice is taken at home of the information that he sends; that his advice is not followed and that he receives no replies or letters from the Secretary of State.]

Col. Robert Clive to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 247, f. 78.] CALCUTTA, *Aug.* 21, 1757.

MY LORD,

I did myself the honour of addressing your Lordship from Charnagore [*i.e.* Chandernagore][1]. I informed your Lordship of the capture of that place [March 23], inclosing all the particulars relative thereto, since which a revolution of much greater consequence to both public and private has been effected, with very little loss, by the defeat and death of the late Subah Surajah Dowlah and the setting up another in his stead, entirely attached to the English interest; this happy event has already been productive of many signal advantages to the trade of the Company. By treaty with the Subah, they have been put in possession of land to the yearly amount of near £150,000, and the other articles of agreement bind him to pay to public and private the sum of 3 millions sterling, one half of which is already received; and I have the pleasure to inform your Lordship that out of that sum he has given to the army and

[1] This letter is missing.

navy £600,000. I shall not trespass upon your Lordship's patience by entering into a particular detail of this great revolution, not doubting but your Lordship will be fully informed by the Court of Directors[1].

Before I conclude, I cannot help observing to your Lordship that both the King's and Company's troops (especially the former) have behaved with great resolution upon all occasion[s], and have gained great reputation in these parts.

I enclose your Lordship a general return of the forces under my command and a journal of our military proceedings, being with great respect,

Your Lordship's most devoted, humble servant,

ROBERT CLIVE.

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 177.] HAGUE, *September 4th*, 1757.

...Since I received your Lordship's letter I have had some general, tho' confidential conversations with the Princess Royal... and this evening she sent for me and begg'd I would present her best compliments to your Lordship and with the strongest assurances of her regard and friendship for you, beg your advice how she should conduct herself; that she wished you to be the mediator for her with the rest of the King's servants....

P.S. *September* 5....The Prussian minister has just shew'd me with tears in his eyes a letter from his Court, which informs me of Monr. Steinberg's[2] having wrote to Berlin to inform their Ministry that the King of England was going to make a separate accommodation. You may easily judge of all that can be said upon such a subject, and all that will be said....Take care of yourselves. I am quite confounded and choose to say no more....J. Y.

Hugh Valence Jones to (his uncle) the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 45.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Sept. 5th*, 1757.

MY LORD,

I am directed by my Lord Duke of Newcastle to acquaint your Lordship that he came this morning from Claremont to Kensington, and in consequence of the accounts brought by the messengers and mails..., found the King in lower spirits than he had almost ever observed him to be. He has frequently seen His Majesty weep, but his eyes were now constantly full of tears, and he ended the conversation with saying: "Pray, my Lord, serve a friend." The material letters from the Duke are in German, so

[1] Surajah Dowlah had continued to intrigue with the French, and was superseded by Clive in favour of Mir Jafir and defeated at Plassey, June 23.

[2] Ernst v. Steinberg, Hanoverian minister of State.

that his Grace has not read them....The King said he hoped he had still 40,000 men but added that his subjects at Hanover, being treated in a most disagreeable manner by the French, were continually pressing him to give them peace....

[Next day (H. 69, f. 47) Jones writes that the King has somewhat recovered his spirits on the support he had received from his ministers, and had spoken very kindly of Lord Hardwicke's assistance.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 188, f. 468.] WIMPOLE, Monday, *Sept. 5th*, 1757.

...I have carefully perused all the American letters and enclosures, at which I am quite surprised. I never read such a *papier raisonné* as my Lord Loudoun's letter in my life; but it verifies what I remember was said of his Lordship, that he might be a very good colonel but was absolutely unfit for chief command....In short, it seems to me that they all proceed upon the *Byng principle*,—that nothing is to be undertaken where there is risk or danger. Byng would not sail down upon Galissonnière, in the only way in which he was attackable, because there would be risk. Not an officer or a soldier was to be landed at Mahon, because there would be danger in it. So now of Louisburg. But if their reasoning is right, it must have been impossible ever to attack it. It is held here that squadrons cannot sail to that country in the winter but must sail in the spring, to be ready there early in the summer. Lord Loudoun says they must arrive there in April (Admiral Holbourne says in *May*); for that "in June the fogs come on so thick, that ships are often a fortnight or three weeks before they dare look upon the land, and they cannot ever remain on that coast after the latter end of September."—According to these gentlemen's account, what a country are we throwing away all this blood and treasure about? It is unapproachable either in summer, autumn or winter....

As to our expedition from hence [against Rochefort], I don't wonder sensible people begin to be uneasy....If I was now in town, I would not take upon me to advise either its not going or going. But I think it will be right to hearken to the opinions of the land and sea officers who are to conduct it, and any other competent judges. If they talk it down, I wish they may not act it down. I don't mean intentionally, but opinion always operates more or less upon conduct....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 188, f. 541; H. 69, f. 49.] CLAREMONT, *Sept.* 10*th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,...

I am very sorry that the chief occasion of troubling your Lordship at present must give you great uneasiness, as I foresee every bad consequence that can happen from it.

The fatal step of a separate peace, or rather separate negotiation for it (for it will never take place), for the Electorate of Hanover, is much further advanced than we imagined, has already been in form communicated to the King of Prussia, who has received it in the manner one must have expected; and probably did, from a knowledge of it, produce the present disposition in the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, to make his immediate peace with France....

I think I mentioned to your Lordship that M. Münchausen was still for sending the mem[oria]l to Ratisbon, which I thought I had effectually stopped; but to my great surprise yesterday, I found the King was determined that the memorial should be published at the Diet and the measure of the separate peace pursued, but I did not then know how far it had gone.

His Majesty had before told me that the Duke of Cumberland had sent to the Marshal Richelieu, to propose a suspension of arms to treat; that the Duke of Richelieu's answer was, "Le Duc de Cumberland se moque de moi. Je ne veux entendre parler de la paix qu'à la paix générale. Mes ordres sont de détruire l'Électorat." Upon which I strongly renewed my instances and humble opinion against this separate peace, founded upon the impossibility of its succeeding: that if the Queen of Hungary would, she could not, bring it about; that the King was the power that France wanted to humble; that the French were quite masters of the Empire and that nothing could be done without their consent, etc., that His Majesty showed me himself that some of his friends in the Empire dared not show him the most common favours. All the answer I could get was, that I did not understand the affairs of the Empire; that His Majesty knew them best; that it was very probable his separate negotiation might not succeed, but that, however, the knowledge of it and that His Majesty would have made his peace, would do him service in the Empire, etc. All I could say signified nothing. He often repeated,—"It was over with the King of Prussia."—And I concluded [by saying] that my zeal for his honour and his interest occasioned my giving him that trouble.

There came letters yesterday (as your Lordship will see) that the King of Prussia had taken the brave resolution to come to defend his possession of Saxony and attack the Prince of Soubise and the army of the Empire (which, I told the King, opened a new scene, and might make the Duc de Richelieu alter his plan). But all signified nothing.—"It was over with the King of Prussia."—

When the two Secretaries went in, the King seemed to them pleased with this news of the King of Prussia; but when, in consequence of it, my Lord Holderness proposed to write a strong letter of encouragement and applause to Mr Mitchell at Dresden, the King said,—"That is very well, but you must take care to say nothing from me (I suppose as Elector). For if the Empress Queen accepts, I am tied."—

The two Secretaries were struck, but I believe said nothing. When they came out, we made our respective reports to each other, whereby it appeared that the King had gone farther with them as to *the fact* than with me. Mr Pitt very properly, but very strongly, enlarged upon it; that it was such a breach of faith as was not to be withstood; that the English ministers must, for the sake of their own honour, disculpate themselves; that particularly Lord Holderness should write (and possibly he did so last night) a strong letter to Mr Mitchell, giving the strongest assurances of support from England to the King of Prussia and treating a contrary behaviour with the appellation of *infamy*. I told him he knew what I had said and done against it, that it was the measure for us, not as ministers, to give any advice upon it. Mr Pitt said that that was only a word of form, that in effect we had advised against it. I did not say to him but to Holderness I said, I was the only one that had had the courage to do it, but since, I very well remember that your Lordship did in one of your conversations. But I believe Mr Pitt never opened his lips upon it to the King. To my Lady Yarmouth, indeed, he had, and did yesterday, talk strongly against it.

Mr Pitt said to us there was nothing to be done but to break it off at once. For it was impossible for ministers to serve upon this foot, and there he is extremely in the right.

As my audience with the King was over for that day, all I could do was to go to my Lady Yarmouth....She...talked (and has acted) with the greatest courage and integrity....

The affair is gone far indeed. Steinberg at Vienna[1] had orders to *sound*, as the King told me; to that an answer is come in the negative. Not discouraged by this, Steinberg has orders to ask an audience of the Empress and make proposals, which proposals, if accepted, the King is obliged to abide by. (But they will not be accepted.) Besides all this, our Münchausen from London has wrote to the Danish minister at Paris, to the same purport. That letter was conveyed by M. Cheüses at the Hague and by him (I suppose) to D'Affry[2], as Joe has discovered. The Duke, who, both my Lady Yarmouth and myself thought would discourage any such dishonourable negotiation, was the most forward to promote it, and Steinberg (her brother-in-law) wrote to Podewils[3]

[1] Baron G. F. v. Steinberg, Hanoverian envoy at Vienna, son of the Hanoverian Minister of State.

[2] Danish and French ministers at the Hague.

[3] Prussian Minister of State.

in a few hours after the orders came to the Duke, and despatched the messenger to his son at Vienna. And farther, my Lady Yarmouth told me that she had taken the liberty to represent in the strongest manner to the King against it, and honestly and bravely told him that it was contrary to his honour and would taint his memory hereafter.

What could be more noble than this? She insisted with the King not to let Münchausen know that she had done so, which the King promised her. She made no impression, but assured the King she thought it her duty to lay this before him, but that she would never open her lips to him again upon it....

I can plainly see that all her letters from Hanover (some I have seen) blame the conduct of the Duke to the greatest degree, and what is extraordinary, I know the King has seen many of them, and last Tuesday talked with as much doubt and dissatisfaction upon the Duke's conduct as any other person could do. And that day His Majesty was under great oppression and talked to me in the most moving manner, that if he had been with his army, things would not have been as they are; that he did not understand it; that the way was to *attack the French*; that now they could retire no further, being got to the sea. He was highly pleased with our readiness to send provisions and ordnance stores (in which nobody was more forward than Mr Pitt), thanked me often and hoped I would "serve a friend*." I daresay he begins to be uneasy at what he has done but cannot go back; though in my opinion, there is not the least probability of his conditions being accepted, even by the Court of Vienna. Poor Lady Yarmouth told me, when people grew old, they had not the same firmness and resolution which they had formerly.

When I had finished my discourse with her, which was as strong as possible, I told her plainly that I apprehended the utmost confusion both at home and abroad upon it. She said she would acquaint the King with all that I had said, which I desired her to do. The King of Prussia, like a wise man, will (for the present at least) forgive all that is past, if we will do well for the future. He proposes a scheme for the Duke's junction with his army at Magdeburg. I flung the same thing, almost, out to the King, but it was treated then as impracticable. I forgot to tell you that Mr Pitt said the application to the Court of Vienna was worse than to France. For that implied *a change of system*, by flinging off the King of Prussia and returning to the Queen of Hungary, which was contrary to the principle of his letter to Spain[1], and would be treated by that Court as a cheat towards them.

Upon the whole, if something cannot be found out to put a short end to this separate measure, Pitt, I am persuaded, will

* This was certainly very affecting. He had been *a friend* to the Duke of Newcastle. H.

[1] p. 123.

quit the King's service, and I can't blame him. I own I never much relished the notion of our not meddling in this affair and gave into it publicly only, because I had nothing to propose. I suspect by Mitchell's most confidential letter to Holderness, and his never having answered my most confidential letter to him, that he either really suspects, or has a mind to have it thought, that this negotiation, which I have represented against, more than anybody, has been secretly favoured by me.

Your Lordship cannot be surprised that, in a point of such importance and which so immediately affects the King's honour and interest, and indeed in some measure, that of all his servants, I should be particular in acquainting you with all the circumstances relative to it which had come to my knowledge, and that I should be desirous to know your Lordship's thoughts upon the whole....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 189, f. 1.] WIMPOLE, *September 11th*, 1757, Sunday night.

MY DEAR LORD,

Though I am extremely obliged to your Grace for the trouble you have taken to give me so full and particular a detail of what has passed relating to the separate negotiation for the Electorate, yet I never received a letter from you which gave me so much uneasiness and anxiety as that of yesterday has done. My heart is too full to say a great deal upon it, and indeed, there is no room to say anything new, because your Grace has made all the just and material reflections upon this unhappy affair that can possibly occur. You have, besides, acted a very honourable and noble part in what you have said to the King upon this subject; and Lady Yarmouth can never be enough applauded for the bold and honest truths which she has spoke to the King on this occasion. For my own part, I remain of the same opinion which I declared from the first:—that this measure can't possibly produce the effect which His Majesty proposes, to save Hanover, but only end in tarnishing the King's honour at the close of a reign, not yet sullied with any step of that nature, and will in the event lose him the few friends that remain; and I have no difficulty in permitting your Grace to acquaint His Majesty that this is my opinion, in decent terms, if you shall think fit. As to the English ministers not giving their opinion in form as ministers, relating to what measures the King should take for Hanover in the present exigency, I thought (when mentioned) that there was weight in it, because they had no scheme of assistance or strength to propose; and if they had given

any such advice, they would naturally have been immediately called upon for it[1]. But I always thought and declared that His Majesty's intention ought to have been previously opened to the King of Prussia, with the appearance of his being consulted upon it, before any proposition for a separate negotiation was made. But the conduct has been quite the reverse. The publication of the memorial, whereof I saw a draft, is a further and unpardonable aggravation of the offence to the King of Prussia; for that paper published at the Diet will be a manifesto against His Prussian Majesty, and an accusation of him to the Germanic Body. I can see no pretence or excuse for it. All the world will say that the English ministers have been dupes to the Hanoverian ministers, and nothing is more clear than that, if the Court of Vienna or France should hearken at all to the proposition, one of the first things insisted on by them, would be that the King should, some way or other, engage not to give any succour or aid to His Prussian Majesty, either in troops or money, *as King*. How will the King then be able to perform his absolute promise to the King of Prussia to give him a subsidy? The case of Great Britain and Hanover is so mixed and entangled in this instance, that neither the Court of Vienna nor that of Versailles will suffer them to be separated, and the performance of that promise will become impossible, if that separate negotiation proceeds. Your Grace knows that I always thought there was great mystery in the manoeuvre at Hanover. I applied it to the conduct of the army, about which the British ministers had no information or correspondence, but I always suspected the same thing as to negotiation. If ten thousand men had been sent from hence to reinforce the Duke's army, instead of being employed in this secret expedition[2] (now late and out of time), some part of this might possibly have been prevented. But that has been long ago over.

I cannot help humbly differing from His Majesty as to the effect his offer of a separate peace will have in the Empire, although it should be refused. He may depend upon it, instead of doing him service there, it will hurt him. It will produce contempt, and that hurts princes more than private men.

Abstracted from the reproach of this measure, there are three

[1] Also H. 3, f. 40. But were not the £200,000 voted this year for the D. of C.'s army, and the continental subsidies, and the maintenance of the Hessian troops a sufficient foundation for the intervention and control of the British ministers? This view was, indeed, adopted later.

[2] Against Rochefort.

consequences likely to follow from it, which His Majesty does not (with humble submission) seem sufficiently to have attended to.

1. It will render it more difficult to support in Parliament the advancement of the £100,000, lately given out of the vote and credit, and the expense of the provision and stores, now sending to the Duke's army, though very right in themselves to be done. For it will be asked to what end, if Hanover is to separate itself from England and no use to be made of that army.

2. It will render any *dédommagement* for the King from Parliament impossible.

3. It may have a worse and more lasting bad effect in respect of the present establishment, by confirming and countenancing that notion, which the disaffected have always propagated, of the inconsistency of the interests of the two countries, and of the fatal influence of Hanover councils on English alliances and measures. For I still go upon this principle, that nothing can possibly be done in this untoward affair without affecting the measures of England....

As to the conduct of His Royal Highness this summer, tho' I say nothing, I don't at all wonder at what is writ from Germany. I have an opinion of my own about it, and I know what other people here say of it. But I lay the less weight upon what the Hanover ministers write upon it, because I believe H. R. Highness and they differed from the beginning. And to confess the truth, I think it would have been much wiser to have followed their advice at first and made a neutrality originally, than to make or offer this shameful separate peace now....

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 191.] HAGUE, *September 16th*, 1757.

MY LORD,

After the departure of the last post I received a letter from H.R.H. the Duke, which confirmed the report of a convention having been signed between H.R.H. and the French general, Marshal Richelieu, but without any particulars, except that of a suspension of hostilities between the two armies. The certainty of this event begins to make a great outcry in Europe and will occasion a much greater, as it comes to be more known. People will not believe that the great Person can have taken such a step without the knowledge and approbation of the English ministers, and therefore don't understand what we mean by saying we will support the King of Prussia to the utmost of our power. I can

easily conceive and forgive this obstinacy in people, because our situation is an enigma, very difficult to solve, and which one cannot clear up without saying more than it is prudent to say. Your Lordship will, however, easily conceive all the invectives that are bestowed upon this conduct, and how disagreeable it is to an honest man to hear such cutting reproaches poured out, and not to be able to justify what is done....

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 16, f. 273.] HAGUE, *September 16th*, 1757.

DEAR BROTHER,

The times we live in are so extraordinary that all the reading of a man as well versed in history as you are, can produce nothing like them....I am really unwilling to write upon the subject. ...You have no doubt expected for some time some submission from the Hanoverians to France; but you had rather, I am sure, they had chose another time, than just when the King of Prussia was marching against the Prince of Soubise in which, if he succeeded, he would certainly, in conjunction with the army of observation, have extricated the Electorate and its allies out of the hands of our enemies. This is, however, the moment in which a convention has been signed between them and the Hanoverians, as H.R.H. the Duke informed me by the last post....You will easily conceive all the dirt that is liberally thrown upon this occasion, and how much the Cabal in this country triumphs upon having withstood our alliance and declined taking any part with those who, they say, would have abandoned them, the moment they were pushed[1]....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 189, f. 129; H. 69, f. 63.] CLAREMONT, *September 18th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,

The letters in this packet, which I received yesterday at noon, will inform your Lordship that the fatal step, in consequence of the separate negotiation, has taken place and that a suspension of arms is signed by the Duke and the Marshal Richelieu, but on what terms, or from what particular cause, at present we are entirely ignorant. I am afraid from the very worst, viz.: that the Marshal Richelieu might be able to detach a considerable reinforcement to the Prince of Soubise which, by the enclosed extract of Colonel Yorke's letter, your Lordship will see, he has actually done, and of which the Prince of Soubise was in the greatest want. If this should be the case, it would add greatly to the misfortune and fatality of this measure, enflame people's minds both here and abroad to the highest degree, and produce the worst consequences in both places. I don't foresee the end of this mischief. There must be some reason we don't yet know....

[1] Further H. 9, f. 201.

I must own His R. Highness's letter to my Lord Holderness is extraordinary; a bare notification of such a considerable transaction to the Secretary of State, without acquainting him with the terms of it, a measure in which England was so immediately concerned (the Hessian troops in our pay being comprehended in it and to act in consequence of it), concluded by the general and commander of those troops without any authority from the government of England, and some orders sent immediately to the commander of the English squadron at the mouth of the Weser. If these questions should come to be asked in Parliament, I don't know what answers can be returned to them.

But what is particularly remarkable in H.R.H.'s letter is the affectation of declaring unnecessarily "that the Hanover dominions *alone* have at their cost employed the whole force of France etc."; this was not put in by chance, but to convey the cause and justification of this most unfortunate measure, which cause is not true in fact, and, if enquired into, must come out to be not so. It also shows how much H.R. Highness is engaged to support this measure. The reason of that may be easily guessed at....

We have, by the King's orders, given a declaration, signed by Lord Holderness, that this measure was without the "participation of the English ministry," and never intended to influence the conduct of England. And yet this suspension is signed by an English general without any authority from hence. Lord Holderness should be very cautious in his answer and refer to the Declaration for his total ignorance of this affair. He should also take notice that H.R. Highness has had no instruction from him and consequently, has acted only by authority from the King *as Elector*. And it deserves consideration whether something should not be said with regard to the Hessian troops, and the effect which this suspension will have with regard to them. One consequence it must have, to stop their pay from the date of this Convention, but then I answer myself,—how can that be done, when the suspension was no act of theirs? In short, the confusion arising from this step is so great, I don't know what to do or say upon it. This last difficulty proves plainly that England is immediately concerned by this act of the Duke's. [He has stopped the payment of £30,000 for the stores and provision for the Duke's army.] But we shall have disputes upon that also; for it appears to me that this Convention is a bare suspension of arms, no restitution of country or revenue at present to His Majesty; "further relief is to be obtained," but when, where and what, we know not. And therefore I suppose His Majesty will desire these provisions should be sent....H.R. Highness is glad to take hold of some expressions in Mitchell's letters[1] to lament the desperate situation of the King of Prussia. Mitchell says nothing can save him....His Prussian Majesty talks decently, but very feelingly, of the Hanoverian measure....

[1] British minister at Berlin.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 189, f. 148; H. 69, f. 73.]

NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Sept. 19th*, 1757, Monday evening, past 7 o'clock.

MY DEAR LORD,

It is by the King's express command that I trouble your Lordship with this letter, to desire that you would come to town to give His Majesty your advice and assistance upon an event which gives the King the greatest uneasiness. His Majesty was pleased to acquaint me this day that H. R. Highness, the Duke, had concluded a Convention with the Marshal Richelieu without His Majesty's approbation, and directly contrary to his orders. The King was pleased to say that his honour and his interest were sacrificed by it; that His Majesty had been by it given up, tied hand and foot to France; that he did not know how to look anybody in the face; that he had lost his honour and was absolutely undone; that he thought the Duke's head was turned or he had lost *his courage*; that he could not tell what to make of it but that he would not have it lay upon him; that he would order Mons. Münchausen to communicate the *whole* to us; that if any other man in the world had done it, he should conclude that he had been bought by France. In short, I never saw such a scene in my life; so moving and so unhappy a man I never beheld, often saying that Providence had abandoned him; he hoped this nation would not forsake him, but support him and the King of Prussia. I own I was so moved by what I saw that I was not able to bear it, as I ought to have done. I did give the King very strong assurances that in these circumstances we would do the best we could, which assurances were repeated and confirmed in full as strong a manner by Mr Pitt.

The King writes a most strong letter of disapprobation himself tomorrow, countersigned by Mons. Münchausen; and His Majesty told me that Lord Holderness should write to H. R. Highness, that he had concluded a scandalous convention without order, and that if His Majesty's army had been half cut to pieces, "this convention would have been scandalous." Nothing can exceed the concern, dejection and resentment of the King, and I think we must take advantage from it to do the best we can for the King and the public. Mons. Michel[1] has been with me this morning to acquaint me in form that his master had ordered him to declare that, whatever may be the issue of the Hanoverian negotiation, His Prussian Majesty would adhere to his alliance with England, go on with his operations and act in concert with us, both in peace and war. The King is pleased with it.

The Convention, by what I hear, is more disadvantageous than that rejected in the winter. And the Duke has executed it without

[1] One of the Prussian envoys in London.

waiting for any further order. Some of the troops are already ordered to pass the Elbe and go into Saxe-Lauenberg; others are to be shut up in Stade; the Hessians to be discharged and sent home and that is an English engagement; and when it appears, as I understand by the King, that the troops could have been supported in Stade, and I hear M. Richelieu has declared that in that position the Duke's army could not be attacked, I am sure I need not doubt your Lordship's complying with the King's desire and that you will come to town....In a confidence that you will set out from Wimpole on Wednesday morning, I will order a meeting on Wednesday evening, and get a little dinner for your Lordship at Newcastle House on Wednesday....

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 189, f. 151; H. 69, f. 75.] *Most secret.*

NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Sept.* 19*th*, 1757, Monday, near 8 o'clock.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am sure you will not doubt about coming. For God's sake don't. Things are in the greatest confusion. The King takes the strongest part against the Duke, and will lay all the blame there. That, at least, will enable us to do the best we can for the future. I fling out to you only, why should not the King take this opportunity to send himself for the Prince of Wales and make a strong union there, and that to be the declared party? The Princess Amelia is extremely disturbed, though she don't know the whole. Lady Yarmouth is outrageous. The King told me that when he talked with the Duke about the French coming here and taking measures to oppose them, the Duke was always for providing for *his retreat*. The King used to say,—"We must think of *attacking them*; you are always talking of a *retreat*."—Pray come away early on Wednesday and believe me,

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. Dinner shall be whenever you order it.

P.S. The Duke has certainly been most notoriously to blame, and that from the beginning. I hope your Lordship don't imagine that I think the blame is *singly* there. But, however, I was glad to see the King willing to get out, and blaming what was done as much as anybody could do. The great point is, what can be done? Join (if possible) the King of Prussia with the Hanoverians and

the Hessians. If the King has not the common power left of confirming or rejecting this Convention by his ratification, he must find out some other way of doing it. *Nil mihi rescribas**.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 189, f. 144.] WIMPOLE, *September 19th*, 1757. At night.

MY DEAR LORD,...

Things are in such a situation, so entangled by the contrast between Great Britain and Hanover, that I am quite at a loss what to say. In meditating upon it I quite lose myself, and find my way crossed in every step. I entirely approve of the Declaration given to Mons. Michel and communicated (as your Grace says) to all the foreign ministers at our Court. But, after this suspension of arms, signed between H.R.H. and Marshal Richelieu, how will that be made good or what room will there be to execute it? I own, I thought that this separate negotiation would never have taken effect....If Hanover should be saved by it (which it will not), it would be owing to His Prussian Majesty's vigour. For there could be no other reason for it but what your Grace assigns, the enabling the Marshal [Richelieu] to detach a considerable reinforcement to that Prince [de Soubise]. How disgraceful will this appear in the eyes of the whole world?

Your Grace has so amply set forth the pernicious effects of this measure that I am unable to add anything to it. You have always found me harping upon the no correspondence and no communication from the army of observation. You now see how it has ended. The Duke does not vouchsafe to refer to any orders for what he has done, nor to give any account of the motives or of what passed in the negotiation, nor so much as to send a copy of the Convention (so far as appears to me), though he calls it "a Convention signed." I know very well what will be said to this—that H.R.H. is employed and authorised as General of the electoral army, without any commission or instructions from the British ministry; that Great Britain is only an auxiliary to Hanover, and the Hessian troops, tho' in British pay, only auxiliary forces. But this will be no answer in Parliament, and when H.R.H. dictated

* N.B. The King was angry not at the Neutrality or separate Convention for Hanover, but that it was a bare suspension of arms, and neither his revenue or country restored to him. The Duke's orders were not very clear and explicit, and he was impatient to get his neck out of the collar. H.

the words "at their cost[1]," he should have recollected that it has been *at the cost of England* to the amount, I believe, of not less than £800,000, with the additional expense lately made. How much more it has cost the Electorate, I know not. But possibly he may mean to include in that expression what the subjects of that country have suffered from the French.

The great and difficult question is, what the English ministers are to do upon this? The act done, so far as it appears, is a suspension of arms, and it will be compared to the Duke of Ormond's separating from the Allies in Queen Anne's war[2]. [He proceeds to calculate the immediate consequences of the measure.] ...However, all reasonable caution must be used, as far as is possible, not to blacken or load the King....

September 20th. Tuesday morning. I this moment receive your Grace's letter of yesterday by your other messenger. I am extremely sorry that your Grace should suggest to the King my being sent for to town. What can I do, or what use can I possibly be of? It will be vastly inconvenient to me, besides I have of late not been very well. I have neither office nor authority to make my being there of any consequence. Don't take things too strongly against the Duke. Don't you remember that His Majesty said to your Grace; "I will order him to make," or "a convention may be made at the head of the two armies"? I will endeavour to be in town tomorrow night, but shall not be able to be time enough to be at any meeting then. Your Grace must not expect me at dinner.

Ever yours,

H.

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 16, f. 275.] HAGUE, *September 20th*, 1757.

DEAR BROTHER,

Because I don't care you should be ignorant of what is passing, I send you enclosed a copy of the famous Convention signed by H.R.H. the Duke, which the wits call *Les Parties honteuses de S. A. R.* You, who know my zeal and the vivacity of it, as well as all the projects I have been forming for a long series

[1] Above, p. 179.

[2] James Butler, second Duke of Ormond (1665–1745), succeeded the Duke of Marlborough, 1712, in command of the troops in Flanders, and received secret orders not to engage in any military action owing to the peace negotiations, finally, in July, withdrawing the British troops from the allied army.

of months to avoid this shameful conclusion, will easily judge of the effect it has upon me. I think I never suffered half so much in my life, tho' the whole world is unanimous in believing that England had no share in it....To what are not we exposed by such a prospect? It is impossible to relate to you a thousandth part of what is said upon the occasion, and how scandalously the authors of this affair are abused. I keep out of the way of hearing these reflexions as much as possible, and content myself with saying that the King of England will support his alliance with the King of Prussia. However this may be founded in truth, you may guess how it is received; for people are not used to see the Electorate separated from the Kingdom....The King of Prussia still holds out and still goes on....In hopes of better times I remain, ever your most obliged and most affectionate brother,

J. Y.

Duke of Newcastle to Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 189, f. 240.] *September 23rd*, 1757.

...[The English ministry had repudiated the Convention. They were to give immediate assurances of support to the King of Prussia, and intended to retain the Hessians and send them to him if possible.] Your Father, who was so good as to come to town upon this great occasion, and thinks *and acts* upon it like himself, is, thank God, perfectly well, and I am always happy and *safe* when he is with me....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 71.] *October 1st*, 1757.

...I have one, and am to have one more letter sent me from the King, tending to shew that the Duke understood the meaning of his orders, tho' he had acted contrary. The King is still more enraged than ever, and told me the other day that he should be mad; that it appeared that the Duke had upwards of 40,000 men, without reckoning the sick. Lady Yarmouth (who continues to act the most commendable part imaginable) told me that she endeavoured to do all she could to calm the King, to beg him to look forward; that it was to no purpose to be always blaming what was passed which could not be redressed at present, but that His Majesty constantly grew angry with her, told her *he* knew better what to do, and in one conversation said, "how to act towards his own children." In short, it is a most melancholy scene....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 82.] *Most secret.* KENSINGTON, *October 3rd*, 1757, near four o'clock.

MY DEAR LORD,

You will be surprised to hear from me so soon, but I should be inexcusable to [be] sending you always bad news and omit...the great news we received yesterday. The Russians are gone home; they have left wounded and sick behind them, 9,000 men and fourscore pieces of cannon. The enclosed accounts from honest Joe give all the particulars we have[1]....This has had the effect, I imagined it would, upon the poor distressed King. His Majesty laments and blames more than ever the late —— Convention, and uses harder expressions upon the author of it. General Sporken is to be sent for tomorrow to come over in all haste, to consider whether the King's army may not be at liberty and join the Prussians. The King's expression to me was—"Depend upon it, my Lord, I am desirous to do it, *if I can*." Mr Pitt is strongly for losing no time and sending an order to General Sporken (who is to be the Commander-in-Chief) to fall upon the French immediately. He treats it as a jest to doubt whether the King has a right to do it, and as much so whether it should be done or not....

[On October 4, 1757 (N. 189, f. 434), Col. Yorke from the Hague describes to the Duke of Newcastle the extraordinary predicament of the troops at Stade in consequence of the Convention, and of the contrary policy and measures of the English ministry. He advises the immediate assembling of the Hessians and Brunswickers under the command of the Hereditary Prince of Brunswick to reinforce the King of Prussia, but expedition was absolutely necessary to save the situation.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 189, f. 438.] *October 4th*, 1757.

[Congratulates the Duke on the happy event of the return of the Russian troops to their own country. But] all this undoubtedly aggravates the misfortune of the Convention, and I don't wonder the King sees it in that light. I make no doubt but His Majesty, upon the Convention being first transmitted to him, had it in his power and was in right to disavow and reject the Convention, if he had thought fit in respect of the consequences. If those consequences[2] don't stand in his way, he has so still, unless some orders have been already sent importing an agreement to it; and

[1] H. 9, f. 195.

[2] The consequences feared were of course the immediate pillage of Hanover by the French troops who were in occupation of it.

I have an imperfect memory of having seen a draft of a letter from the King to the Duke sent by Mons. Münchausen, directing H.R.H. to apply to M. Richelieu to procure some further explanations or relaxations for his army. I own, I would not on any account have the King do an act that may import justly a breach of faith with his enemies after what has happened with his friends....

Lord Anson to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 11, f. 401.] ADMIRALTY, *October 6th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,

I wish I could send your Lordship any agreeable news[1], but there seems to be a fatality in everything we undertake and that nothing succeeds....The fleet having done well and all in their power gives me satisfaction; but why Hawke put his name to any council of war, when I warned him so strongly against it, astonishes and hurts me. It is now past one o'clock and I just come from Council, heartily tired with the reflection that not one event from the beginning of the war has come before us, that has not been unfortunate....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 189, f. 471.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 8th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,...

The King was extremely displeased that when Marshal Richelieu had given so fair a handle for breaking the Convention by that most insolent contravention of it, in insisting to disarm the Hessians, etc., the Duke had thought proper, without orders or even acquainting the King, to send to Count Lynar to patch it up with M. Richelieu[2]....

The orders of the 20th and 21st, with the King's disapprobation of the Convention, luckily arrived before the troops, which had halted, were again put into motion; and we are told that the Hessians will certainly wait, and the King's own troops not cross the Elbe, till further orders. And the messengers that went on Wednesday and Thursday carried positive orders to recall them, if within reach, and the Hanover ministry were directed to take this occasion to *break the Convention*, if not made up (as it is in a fashion), or to find out some other, if that should be the case.... Your Lordship has copies of the Duke's letters to Lord Holderness "upon his severe reproof." His Majesty was yesterday stronger in his expressions than ever. "His rascally son," "his blood was

[1] On the subject of the expedition to Rochefort.

[2] Count Lynar, the Danish minister who negotiated the Convention. N. 189, f. 434.

tainted"; and upon my only wishing that the King would stay and hear His Royal Highness and shrugging my shoulders with concern at such harsh expressions, His Majesty replied,—"A scoundrel in England *one day* may be thought a good man *another*; in Germany it is otherwise; I think like a *German*."—The King flung out to me, and afterwards to the Secretaries, that he should not say much to the Duke himself, but that he would send us, his ministers, to His Royal Highness to see what he had to say for himself. Sure, it is improper for the English ministers to go upon this errand. But if insisted upon, how can we avoid it? [The King had decided to demand a treaty from M. Richelieu for the Electorate, and on his refusal, to denounce the Convention.] Lord Mansfield is very doubtful about breaking the Convention, Pitt most violent for it. Your Lordship has had a full account of the most extraordinary and unintelligible and absurd proceeding of the land officers upon our expedition. Mr Pitt is outrageous upon it; is not angry with the officers, but imputes it to a prevailing opinion that neither the King nor the Duke wished success to this expedition, treated it as a chimera of Mr Pitt's, which must miscarry, in order to show that the only practicable thing to be done was to employ our whole force in *a German war*, and this he combines with Lord Loudoun's late conduct in North America. He talked high and passionately to us. He did not see how he could go on, and that in these circumstances he did not know whether he should enter at all into the affairs of Germany as he should otherwise have done; but your Lordship will see that he altered his mind as to that. He behaved very properly and well last night....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 189, f. 487.] WIMPOLE, *October 9th*, 1757.

[Discusses the Hanoverian entanglement.]...Whenever H.R.H. comes, the King should, and he certainly will, talk to him himself. Who can talk to the King's son on such a subject with authority and dignity but the King himself? If His Majesty adheres to the sending his English ministers, it must be to receive information; for no orders came from them....If any of the English ministers are to be sent, let several of them go; and don't let it be put upon one alone, as it was upon your humble servant, to communicate the plan of the Regency Bill[1]....

[Deplores the issue of the expedition against Rochefort.]

[1] Above, vol. ii. 46.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 190, f. 56; H. 69, f. 96.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 12th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,

I don't think of troubling your Lordship to come to town, so you may be easy, tho' I have more occasion for your presence and advice than ever I had in my life. The Duke came last night and had a short conference with the King of four minutes. His Majesty gave me an account of the whole.—The King told His Royal Highness that he had ruined his country and his army and had spoiled everything, and hurt, or lost, his own reputation. The Duke defended himself by his orders etc. and said that if he could set himself right with the King, as to his reputation, he must do the best he could, insinuating that he had no apprehensions on that head. He then gave the King a paper containing his justification by a recapitulation of his orders. The King has ordered Münchausen to answer it and make his observations upon it, and I am to have it. Afterwards His Majesty told me that the Duke had desired my Lady Yarmouth to ask the King's permission to resign his employment, and in that, I hear, His Royal Highness is serious. I asked the King whether he thought His Royal Highness would persist in it. He said he did not know; "he was obstinate."...His Royal Highness told her [Lady Yarmouth] that after what the King had wrote to him and of him, he could not continue in service with honour. [He desires to have Lord Hardwicke's advice as to what part he shall take in this affair.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 190, f. 65; H. 69, f. 99.] WIMPOLE, *October 13th*, 1757.

...I cannot help expressing my apprehensions that the affair is even now put in a very wrong way. It seems to be coming to a paper war between the King and his son, not becoming the situation of either. Besides, we have seen how incorrect the Hanover Chancery has been in making recitals of orders and representing the force of words. I also look upon it to be put upon the most unfavourable point in the world for the King. The Duke endeavours to justify himself by his orders. Mons. Münchausen is to reply by observations upon them and the execution of them[1]. We know how extensive the orders are and what a latitude they give. The true question, therefore, is upon the *necessity* under which the Duke actually was at the time, the *conduct* which had brought them into that necessity, and the *prudence* exercised thereupon. Further,

[1] See H. 69, ff. 101–11.

I cannot help observing to your Grace, that in the apostille to the Duke's letter of September 24th, contained in your pacquet, H.R.H. expressly refers to *instructions given him at his departure from England.* This makes me suppose that they were in writing, though I never before heard that he had any such, but it is there positively said that they tended to an eventual retreat to Stade. [He strongly urges the Duke not to take any part in the dispute, except to endeavour to soften the King's resentment against his son.]

[On October 15, 1757 (N. 190, f. 120; H. 69, f. 115), the Duke of Newcastle informs Lord Hardwicke that there have been signs of relenting on the part of the King towards the Duke of Cumberland; that he had said that he intended to coax him, and desired that, if he resigned his office of Captain General, he would keep his regiment of guards. But the Duke was determined to quit both, and had said that he "preferred the King to everything but his honour, and that must be the dearest to him." Mr Pitt desired that the appointments should be filled up immediately. The latter was "very violent" upon the behaviour of the land officers in the late expedition, and attributed the failure to "a formed design in a great part of the army against him." Even the loss of Minorca had not occasioned a greater popular outcry. Lord Anson and Sir Edward Hawke had both thought it practicable. The King had determined to throw in his lot with the King of Prussia.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 190, f. 143.] WIMPOLE, *October 16th*, 1757.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I cannot say that I like appearances at Court; for things seem to me to be going, by degrees, to take that turn, which I have often hinted to your Grace, and you were unwilling to believe. I think I see an intrigue amongst some persons, near to the King, to bully him. In that light I never pitied the King so much as I do at this instant. What! coax—invite to the breakfast and the cards! For God's sake, from whom ought the *coaxing*, from what side ought the submission to come? But the intrigue is to make His Majesty appear to be in the wrong, and to state the Duke in the light of the injured person. If H.R.H. had thought fit to continue in, none of the ministers would, nor I think should, have offered to disturb him, or to give him any just cause of offence. But if he has done wrong, things

ought not to be so managed at Kensington as to cover H.R.H. at the King's expense. Nobody can be further from inclining that the King should be implacable, either as King or Father, but I wish him to support his own dignity and authority as both.

[He agrees with Pitt that the military vacancies should be filled up immediately, and that they should not by any means be kept open for the Duke of Cumberland to return in triumph. The appointment of some man for the chief command over the whole army was absolutely necessary], for if it is not so, but the generalship is supposed to remain in the King, I see plainly where it will soon centre behind the curtain, and that will be the worst of all for the reason you very wisely give, viz. that the Duke will have the whole army in his power without being responsible. [Sir John Ligonier should be made Captain-General over all the forces at home and abroad. Nothing less would have a right appearance for the King or be a support for the administration. If the behaviour of the land officers was such as Sir Edward Hawke had described, there ought certainly to be an enquiry into their conduct.] If things go on thus, war must be given over by this country for want of hands and hearts to carry it on. The scene is really too ridiculous. It is true that "the officers concerned are men of great quality, rank and distinction"; but if that objection should finally prevail, men of quality ought not to be let into the army, for it will ruin the service. Indeed, I have for some time thought that the army was too full of them, and that the public would be better served by having more soldiers of fortune, and perhaps some foreigners of service and experience, if that restriction could be opened. I don't wonder that Mr Pitt is very anxious about this.... I wish your Grace would see the Duke's original instructions. It is to me extremely material, if an eventual retreat to Stade was there originally pointed out. Much depends on the scheme and route of the retreat....

Your Grace is so good as to assure me that you never quote my opinions but where you think I should wish you should. But your Grace must forgive me in begging that it may not be done to anybody at all. These are very delicate subjects to put opinions upon into writing, and I give them with that freedom that I assure you I would not do to any other person in the world....

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 190, f. 222; H. 69, f. 124.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 23rd*, 1757.

MY DEAREST LORD,

[Thanks him for his continued support and counsel.] Indeed, my dear Lord, with your full opinion, I am always safe and easy, however I may differ with others. [He will be careful never to divulge it.]

The resignation [of the Duke of Cumberland] took place either Saturday or Sunday last. The King told me of it on Monday, said he would keep the command *himself*....I said little, hinted in general about Sir John Ligonier, but thought the best way would be to prepare him by my Lady Yarmouth, which I did, for the representations which would be made to him.

Mr Pitt was very strong, and in his usual manner hinted at the necessity of uniting even in representations in writing to the King upon the subject. I laid the necessity of the measure before my Lady Yarmouth and, without naming your Lordship, did with truth tell her that it was not only Mr Pitt's opinion, but the opinion of everybody who wished well to the King to whom I had spoke. I made use, as from myself, of all your Lordship's arguments; and tho' I did not quite like her manner, I thought what I said would be faithfully repeated and have its weight.

The next day (Tuesday) I came to the charge, and indeed I set out ill. I laid before the King the necessity of having some person under His Majesty, who should have the appearance of the command; that there could be nobody more proper or less to be feared than Sir John Ligonier, who would always be agreeable to the King and at his command. His Majesty was still in the negative, that he would have no Marshal; would command himself; would not dispose of the regiment yet, and when I urged (which certainly made the most impression) the opinion that would prevail, if nothing was done, that it[1] was all a collusion between His Majesty and the Duke, that Abreu told me the Duke would return no more, the King replied with eagerness—"That is not so; he has sent me word otherwise by the Duke of Devonshire. I can't trust him abroad, but here he will be under my eye and can't do any hurt—or to that purpose;—besides, if I have a mind to be reconciled to my son, who has anything to do with it or to say against it?"—"God forbid, Sir, they should; everybody must or should wish it; your Majesty knows that I have never said one word to blow up, on the contrary"—hinting that the King had been displeased with me for it. This was very bad, and yet in this very conversation, he said as many bitter things against the Duke, "tainting his blood," etc. as in any of the preceding ones. The two Secretaries went in after me. The King gave them a very

[1] *I.e.* the Convention.

good handle by saying that he was convinced that France would make some attempt here, probably on the Docks at Plymouth or Portsmouth, and that we must be prepared.

Mr Pitt took the hint. The other Secretary [Lord Holderness] did not say one word during the conversation. Mr Pitt said—"With whom, Sir, must we confer? it will be necessary to have some person to be Commander-in-Chief with whom your ministers may consult."—"I will have no Marshal, no Captain-General. There is Ligonier, you can talk to him, etc."—Pitt strongly insisted that there must be some Commander-in-Chief, when there was so large an army, and during a war. His Majesty remained just as he was when I left him, but I believe it was after this conversation that Mr Pitt talked so strongly to me about representations in writing, etc. I assured him I would go the next day and do my utmost, and indeed I succeeded beyond the utmost of my expectations and equal to my wishes.

Sir John Ligonier went in first on Wednesday morning. The King sent for him and talked very graciously to him, that he (Ligonier) must have the chief direction under His Majesty; (I forgot to tell your Lordship that in a former conversation the King told me that his son knew the officers well and made proper recommendations), that Ligonier must find out the best officers. [When the Duke of Newcastle went in, the King confirmed to him his consent to the appointment of Sir John Ligonier as Commander-in-Chief.] To conclude this day's conversation.—"My Lord, tell me truth?"—"I certainly will, Sir."—"It is in a family affair. Did you ever hear that his (my son's) head turned at the Battle of Laffield [Lauffeld]."—"I call God to witness, Sir, that I never did."—"I have, and if I had known it, I never would have employed him this year. I have also heard the same at the Battle of Hastenbeck."—I asked him why such a part of the army did not act that day. He made me no answer. This last remarkable anecdote your Lordship may be assured I don't mention.—When I came out of the Closet and acquainted Mr Pitt with my success, I never saw a man more pleased, fuller of approbation; that I knew better than anybody the way of acting there (at Kensington); that I had done the greatest service; and in short, nothing was so good or so right as myself....[Pitt wanted the immediate suspension of Lord Loudoun in America, but the Duke desired to get the appointment of Ligonier over first, which occasioned many "strong absurd" things from Pitt. Ligonier's appointment was settled as Commander-in-Chief of the army in Great Britain with the Commander-in-Chief of the army in America to correspond with him.]

Mr Pitt behaved very decently and properly last night; tho' now and then he insisted upon improper points and improper conclusions; but I have too many proofs of the uncertainty of his temper, even upon the very objects which he the day before was satisfied upon; and he never makes a scruple of asserting his own

consistency, tho' the very contrary is the fact, but as I have bore it and he comes again round, I shall endeavour to bear it or, at least, I will make no complaint. Poor Holderness is a greater cipher than ever....[What was to be said in the King's Speech? The Hanoverian ministers had sent an unanimous opinion against breaking the Convention, but nevertheless the King had despatched orders for it to be done, except in the contingency of the King of Prussia being defeated or making separate terms with France.... The Duke of Cumberland was gratified by Pitt's justification of him[1], and his party gave out that Pitt had said that he thought, "the Duke had acted within his orders." He believes that he remembers something of the same sort said by Pitt at one of their meetings, when he was angry with the King]....

I am just come from Leicester House, where I had a most indifferent and shameful reception. I stood at your Lordship's door, and as soon as the Princess perceived me, she turned her head to the window and went into the Drawing Room. She afterwards spoke to me very civilly, but after waiting almost the whole Drawing Room, the Prince of Wales did me the honour only to say, "Was you at Claremont last week?", the same question he asked me yesterday. Lord Bute told me he should know in ten days whether he should be satisfied with me or not. It is too much to be the first object of the resentment of the Duke, etc., because I have been able to establish a ministry he does not like and that he thinks Leicester House does, and to be treated there in this impertinent manner. Something must be done, but what I know not. Pray think of it. Mr Pitt, I suppose, will have no sharer with him anywhere if he can help it.

[Lord Hardwicke, writing on October 24, 1757 (N. 190, f. 253), to the Duke of Newcastle, discusses again the subject of Sir John Ligonier's appointment and urges the great importance of "conferring a real supreme command over the army."] One great point of view with me is the recommendations and influence in appointing and promoting officers in the army, which is not only of great consequence to the army, but to the administration also. Your Grace will remember what the King said to you, "that his son knew the officers well and made proper recommendations." By the bye, I wish it had always come out so. But if this point is not some way or other secured, I fear the recommendations will soon go in the same channel. If it is secured, my view is answered. ...H. R. Highness's acknowledgment of Mr Pitt's civility on occasion of what he said to D'Abreu, is very particular. I think H.R.H. has the same obligation to us all, for we all concurred as to the extent of the general words of the orders. If there is any merit in

[1] See above, p. 122 *n*.

it, I think I have as much as anybody; for I was chiefly instrumental in bringing those orders before the Lords and professed to do it out of justice to the Duke, but I shall never claim that merit. But it is abominable in D'Abreu to represent, as he has done to Grimaldi, that the Convention was made by the King's orders, "in clear and express terms." That is a downright falsity; for whatever general words the orders conclude with, they contain no such thing "in express terms." Nay, they are really contradicted by not procuring any advantages or *soulagement* at all for the country.... [He proposes to come to town at the end of next week, but is at a loss to see what good any one can do.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 69, f. 151.] CLAREMONT, *November 5th*, 1757.

...The King asked me yesterday in an eager manner when your Lordship would be in town. I told him this day, with which His Majesty was extremely pleased. You will find the King in extreme good health and in better spirits than you would expect. L[ady] Y[armouth] tells me His Majesty is sanguine about breaking the Convention. Her Ladyship is not, tho' she wishes it. Mr Pitt puts the whole upon it, and lays it down for certain that the Convention will be talked of in Parliament, and what are the King's ministers to say, if it is not broke? Are they to sit quiet and say nothing? He wants to have the merit of breaking it. Finding him in this unquiet temper, I told him, and with that he seemed pleased (and indeed with nothing else), that your Lordship would be in town this evening, and I desired him to reserve himself at liberty for Monday night, that your Lordship and I, or you alone, would wait upon him that evening to talk these things fully over; that nobody else should be there. That pleased him. It is my opinion that you had better go alone. He will talk more freely and we shall better know what he would be at, and consequently regulate our conduct accordingly; and I will own freely to him that I had wished it might be so; but however, that need not be determined till Monday at dinner, when I hope you will punish yourself to eat a boiled chicken with me alone.... The Duke's people continue to assert that Mr Pitt has acted with more civility to the Duke than any of the ministers, and repeat what they assert Mr Pitt to have said about the orders*....I shall be in town very early to attend my Lord Keeper to Westminster Hall[1]. I thought you would like that compliment....And now, my

* The Duke's people probably availed themselves of some pompous respectful language of Mr Pitt's, which meant nothing. They were angry with the D. of N., for not joining H.R.H. H.

[1] Sir Robert Henley. The procession to Westminster Hall to install the new Lord Keeper was generally attended by the great officers of state.

dearest Lord, give me leave again to thank you for your kind, wise, unreserved and cordial advice during the whole summer. The only return I can make is gratitude and compliance, which shall never be wanting. My wish is completed, and I have nothing to ask but the continuance of that unreserved friendship which is my pride, happiness and security....I have had another very full and satisfactory conversation with the Solicitor-General[1]. I am ever unalterably yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Earl of Hardwicke to Col. Robert Clive

[H. 247, f. 104.] POWIS HOUSE, *November 11th*, 1757.

SIR,

I received the favour of your letter, dated from Calcutta the 23rd of February last, about the latter end of September, while I was in the country, and at the same time a Journal of your proceedings in the expedition, carried on to the taking of Chandernagore[2]. I am highly obliged to you for this communication and for the regard shewn to me in it; and I most heartily congratulate you on the important service you have done our King and country, and the great honour you have acquired to yourself. You have, by the blessing of God, gained a complete and most signal victory over such a superiority of numbers as sounds prodigious to European ears, and thereby shewn what true English spirit and courage, under the direction of right conduct, is capable of performing. It was very happy also that you had the assistance of so able a sea-officer as Admiral Watson, who I find from your narrative as well as from others, did his part extremely well. The account you give of the riches of Calcutta is surprizing, since the loss of private property is valued at so great a sum as two millions sterling.

The services which you have rendered to the East India Company, by the recovery of so considerable a settlement, and by the vengeance which you have justly taken for the unprovoked injuries done them, cannot fail to recommend you in the strongest manner to their favour and protection, without any other support; but if any other were wanting, you may rest assured of my best assistance with the Court of Directors, or in any other place, where my good offices may be of use to you[3]. I wish I could in return send you an account of any success of our military operations in

[1] Charles Yorke.

[2] H. 569, ff. 1 sqq.

[3] See H. 9, ff. 312, 315.

this part of the world, equal to what you have obliged us with. But our misfortune in not being able to do this does, by the contrast, set your merit in the stronger light. You have my most earnest wishes for the preservation of your life and health, and for the continuance of your good success for the interests of your country and your own honour.

Since my coming to town, I have seen my old acquaintance, your father, who is very happy in the reputation his son has gained, and to whose applications for your service I shall always be very attentive.

I am with the greatest esteem, and truth, Sir, etc.

[HARDWICKE.]

Col. the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 227.] HAGUE, *January 17th*, 1758.

MY LORD,

The English mail, which arrived here on Sunday morning last, brought me the honour of your Lordship's letter of the 5th and 10th instant...I confess myself almost afraid to enter the lists with your Lordship upon the important contents of it, tho' I have not the good fortune entirely to agree with you in all the conclusions you draw from our present situation[1]...I will suppose that some part of your Lordship's letter is calculated to moderate that *sanguine* spirit which is laid to my charge in some places, but which I can safely say has never been carried so far as to lose sight of the end of this war, to which I will neither give the epithet of fortunate nor unfortunate, till we are got to the end of it....In order to form a right judgment of the present situation of affairs, it is necessary to recollect what is past; and if one does but reflect upon the league which was formed last year to crush the King of Prussia, and then consider how it is broke, I think every sensible person must admit that the crisis is over and that His Prussian Majesty has got the better of the danger[2]. The flower of the Austrian army is destroyed, the finances drained, the officers discontented, the Empire terrified, the thunder of the Diet suspended; Sweden on the point of making peace, if it is not already signed; Russia unwilling, incapable of continuing the war; Denmark afraid for Holstein, and therefore, tho' not an active friend, yet certainly will do nothing to disoblige the King and the King of Prussia. France, on the other hand, is divided upon the object of

[1] Lord Hardwicke had urged that the "final issue of things" should receive more attention and had pointed out the precarious situation on the continent, depending on one life, that of the King of Prussia, continually in danger. H. 9, f. 221.

[2] p. 124.

the war. Those, who began it, meant to ruin England by conquering America and raising the naval force of their country. The new turn, that has been given to the war by the alliance with Austria, has changed the object of the war; and America is forgot to a degree in the hope of obtaining the Netherlands. Peace is much desired by them; but since the battle of Rosbach there is no touching that string with them, and they must have another check, before they can be talked with upon the subject. If we are so fortunate, by the efforts we make, as to drive them over the Rhine and to free Lower Saxony from their fetters, I think we may enter upon preliminaries with a good grace; but till then it is in vain to talk of it, for we should be very ill received.

The heroism of the King of Prussia is an incontestable point; his superior talents in the field and in the cabinet are universally received. His resources are of the best sort; they are drawn from his genius, and as that is superior to any other, we have seen what it is able to perform and it has made him indeed a match for all the Powers united against him, tho' they are of the sort we call above his match from the computations in the closet. I own I am not in pain for his recruiting his army, nor does he appear to be so; and tho' I can't tell your Lordship where he can procure troops *in corps*, yet I can say that if he and the King recruit and augment theirs, which they may do, they will have more real service from them and perform better feats than with an army composed of half the troops of Europe, met in alliance together. I must be forgiven if I don't compute with the modern politicians and generals, after having seen what has happened last campaign: for even supposing that 1000 men were more in proportion for him to lose than 5000 men to his enemies[1]; yet, directed by himself, I believe the odds are greatly on his side. Having said thus much upon my confidence in this royal hero, I shall perfectly agree with your Lordship that the *momentum* of this state of affairs depends greatly upon his life, and that makes me more eager to take advantage of every hour, whilst it pleases God to preserve him. We must not, however, think that his Majesty is exposed like a common officer, for that is not the case. He knows too well the consequence of his own preservation to risk it in that idle manner, and as to his health, he never enjoyed it so well as since he marched from Potzdam in 1756, as many who have had the honour to attend him have assured me, and I think I can venture to assure you of it....

It is with pain I turn my eyes to our own part of the war..., tho' I cannot see that our antagonists, the French, have much more reason to boast than we; for, except the strange affair of Minorca, pray, what have they done?...

[On January 29, 1758 (H. 69, ff. 185, 187; N. 192, ff. 256, 273) the Duke of Newcastle forwards a violent letter from Pitt on the subject of Andrew Mitchell, British Envoy to the King of Prussia,

[1] Such was Lord H.'s contention.

censuring Mitchell's demands for reinforcements for Prince Ferdinand's army, declaring his fixed resolution not to agree to them, expressing at the same time the most unjustifiable suspicions of Mitchell's fidelity and complaining of his subservience to Hanoverian interests. "The tools of another system are perpetually marring every hopeful measure of the present administration. In a word, if your Grace is not able to eradicate this lurking, diffusive poison a little more out of the mass of government, especially from the vitals, I think it's better for us to have done*." The Duke deplores Pitt's unreasonableness and his fixed opposition to sending the troops, and desires to know Lord Hardwicke's opinion.]

[On January 31, 1758 (H. 16, f. 304) Col. Yorke writes on the choice of generals for America]—There are good and spirited men amongst the officers there, but I must tell you beforehand that Abercrombie is a man of no genius and therefore must be assisted. ...Amherst[1] and Wolfe[2] are good officers, and I believe will do honour to their protectors, at least that is my opinion of them[3]....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[H. 192, f. 498.] POWIS HOUSE, *Sunday, Feb. 19th*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD,

Though I have no material information to give your Grace, yet I would not omit acquainting you that I had my conference with Mr Pitt yesterday in the evening, by his own appointment. I found him wrapt up, in his easy chair, but low in spirits, possibly fatigued by being taken out of his bed. We ran over the subjects now depending....He seemed to be much affected with the revival of these intrigues of the Hanover ministers...that he saw a certain *great person* so apt to spoil his own business, that he pitied those who had served him formerly whom possibly he had been forward to blame.

* All Pitt's suspicions about Mitchell were ill-grounded. He wrotè from his own and the King of Prussia's sense.... H.

[1] Jeffrey, afterwards Field-Marshal and Baron Amherst (1717–1797); comrade and correspondent of Joseph Yorke, formerly on the Duke of Cumberland's staff; now Major-General and given a command in North America; later in the year superseded Abercromby as commander-in-chief and carried out a brilliant campaign.

[2] James Wolfe (1727–1759); afterwards the famous conqueror of Quebec; he had served with Joseph Yorke under the Duke of Cumberland in the campaign in Scotland, and was now despatched as brigadier-general of the force against Louisburg.

[3] Also H. 16, f. 320. All these judgments of persons were signally confirmed by events. Of General James Abercromby Lord H. writes on September 11 (H. 4, f. 43): "I don't know the gentleman, but remember I was present last winter at the meeting where he was proposed to be appointed, and from the character then given of him, expressed my disapprobation of it." He was defeated at Ticonderoga, July 8, 1758, and recalled the next year.

We had a good deal of talk on the topic of Joe's being the resident minister with the King of Prussia[1]. I declared myself strongly against it, and was entirely objective. He reasoned, or perhaps I should have said, painted, in the same manner he did to your Grace, but talked moderately and with some deference to what should be my final opinion. I did by no means give way, but chose to leave it so till Joe comes. I left him in good humour, much satisfied with your Grace, but far from being so with the situation, and upon the whole low....I am in continual expectation of Joe....

Most sincerely and affectionately, my dearest Lord,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Holderness

[R. O. State Papers: Prussia.] Private. BERLIN, *April 4th*, 1758.

MY LORD,

So much has been said to me about Mr Mitchell's subject by the ministers here, that it is my duty to acquaint your Lordship of it, tho' they tell me that both M. Knyphausen and Mr Michel have been instructed by the King of Prussia to solicit his continuing with His Prussian Majesty. [His recall, it was represented, would give the appearance of some misunderstanding between the two courts. The King of Prussia had expressed great satisfaction with his conduct, and it was hoped that further orders would be received from England on his subject.]

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Holderness

[R. O. State Papers: Prussia.]

LANDSHUT IN THE MOUNTAINS OF SILESIA, *April 11th*, 1758.

MY LORD,...

Your Lordship will not expect an account of any kind of ceremonial having accompanied my first audience. His Prussian Majesty, whom I was glad to find in such good health and humour, came down stairs into the room where his aides-de-camp dine and there received my credential letter from the King, and exprest the greatest pleasure and satisfaction at the account I had the honour to give him of the King's health, and at the satisfaction His Majesty received from the useful assistance the King of Prussia had given, in order to enable the King's army under Prince Ferdinand to drive the French out of Lower Saxony, and to push

[1] Above, p. 21.

them to the Rhine. He was then pleased to order me to follow him upstairs, into his own room, where he kept me above two hours alone. It will be difficult to give your Lordship an exact detail of all that was said to me because it was not confined to one point, or in any method; but I will endeavour to collect all that appeared to me as material to the present situation of affairs, or to the object of my mission.

After I had briefly explained to His Prussian Majesty the motives that had given rise to the honour I then had of paying my duty to him, and how happy I had been to learn from Baron Knyphausen upon the road, that he was charged to remove all farther doubts and delays, he told me that he was sorry anything he had done had created any difficulties, or opened a field for any suspicions or jealousies; that he had never imagined his not having signed the treaty could have produced them, but that when he found they existed, he had not hesitated a moment to give orders for putting an end to them at once. Nothing, continued that Prince, could be more natural or more innocent than the terms of the treaty of itself, and I could have no reason for not signing an engagement which bound me both in war and peace to the King of Great Britain; I had no suspicion of your having any idea to return to the Austrians, nor did it enter into my head to go back to the French; I look upon both those things as impossible, nor would the Courts of Vienna and Versailles unite with us, as they were before; at least, I have no foundation to think, if I had a mind for it, that the French would return to me, or easily forgive me for signing a treaty, as I did with the King your Master; nor can I, believe me, forget the treatment they have shewed to me. I am desirous, therefore, to continue united with your Court, to make our peace together, when we can; to do our best to obtain a good one, and to labour with you to extend our connections, to endeavour to break the league that is formed for our destruction. Upon the article of the subsidy, I was very sensible of the generosity and goodwill of the English nation; but I have often said and repeat it again, that I have an abhorrence of being a burden to my allies, or of taking their money if I can do without it; and at the time I first objected to it the Russians were not come back upon me, and I had hopes of finishing with the Swedes, in which case I thought I could support the war by myself. I won't pretend to say that I may be able to do it at the long run, but I would do it as long as possible, and when I could do it no longer, I should make no scruple of receiving assistance, in order to support the cause and myself. This, I can assure you, was the only motive for my conduct; but when I saw it was otherwise interpreted, I gave up the point, and am very glad you are of opinion that my doing it will be agreeable to your Court, and help to consolidate our Union.—

After this exposition of the motives of his late conduct, His Prussian Majesty was pleased to enter into some reasoning upon

the nature of the war which England proposed to carry on against France, and the necessity of attempting to strike some blow which might tend to decide the war in our favour. He said that after all that had passed he would not touch upon the point of sending a corps of British troops to the Continent, whatever might be his private opinion, which he gave up to that of others, and because it was equal to him, provided France was attacked, in what place we struck the blow. His Majesty expressed great satisfaction at the idea I attempted to give him of the exertion of our strength in North America, and of the notion I had of the manner in which that strength would probably be employed, of which he was pleased to say he had not had so exact an account before. Under this head he mentioned his wishes that, since it was not thought advisable to send our troops upon the continent, we would at least adopt what he termed *le système des démonstrations,* that is to persuade the world that we had some such intentions; that he was sure it would have a very good effect, and particularly that the collecting some transports in the harbours nearest to the coasts of Flanders and moving some troops that way, would greatly embarrass Count Clermont[1] and prevent him from collecting more strength, particularly to keep in check that body of troops, which is said to be assembling towards Dunkirk. He added that he had charged Monsieur de Knyphausen to mention this point, which he hoped would not be disapproved; for that, tho' he might be often wrong, yet when a thought came into his head, he could not help communicating it to his allies.

The next point that occurred in the conversation was the squadron to be sent into the Baltic, upon which His Prussian Majesty said that he would not insist, if it was impracticable, because it was absurd to insist upon an impracticability; that he did not desire to set us at variance with the Powers of the North, but on the contrary; and that he was very sensible of the various and important services in which our Fleet was employed; but that he thought a squadron of a few ships might be of great service, tho' they did not fire a shot; and he was of opinion that none of the Powers there would choose to begin with us, because they must be sensible that, tho' the first blow we gave them was not a material one, it might be in our power to strike a second, to which they would not choose to expose themselves; that he could not help wishing for every reason therefore that we would send at least a few frigates; that his ports in Pomerania would be at our service, and that if it was given out at the same time that a larger fleet was destined for that service, it might serve the present moment, and obtain for him a respite of six weeks or two months at least.

I endeavoured to convince the King of Prussia, and he was at least complaisant enough not to appear dissatisfied with what I said, that the King was as desirous as he could be of giving His

[1] Louis de Bourbon, Comte de Clermont (1709–1770), son of the Prince de Condé, succeeded the Duc de Richelieu in command of the French forces in Hanover and proved a very unsuccessful general.

Prussian Majesty all kind of satisfaction upon this head; that it was not out of any ill-timed or impolitic delicacy for any of the Powers leagued against him that that measure had not been immediately adopted, but from the various and extensive services in which the navy of England was employed, and the prudence that appeared necessary, not to expose the King's arms to be insulted, from the want of a sufficient force to make them respected; that the whole force of France by the measures the King had taken this winter, had been obliged to stay in Europe; and that he would be sensible, considering the force we had abroad, it was necessary to be upon our guard, and preserve something more than an equality, near home; that I could not pretend to say whether the King would approve of the proposition of sending a few ships, because I was persuaded that His Majesty had rather send a sufficient force or none at all. This part of the conversation ended without any kind of warmth on the part of His Prussian Majesty, or any complaint of the objections that had been thrown in the way of his wishes and, if I may be allowed a conjecture, I should suppose that the reciprocal stipulations[1] of a body of troops to be sent to Prince Ferdinand, in case a fleet was sent to the Baltic, may be one principal reason, why His Prussian Majesty is not so sanguine upon that point as he appears to have been some time ago.

The rest of our conversation turned upon the situation affairs had been in of late, the surprising turn they had taken, the despicable figure the French made in the war, and the necessity of our uniting ourselves in the closest manner and acting entirely in concert. I took an opportunity to open to His Majesty, the King's thorough intentions upon this head, of which I had liberty to give him the most convincing proofs, from the instructions I had received, for which he exprest himself highly obliged, and said that he had no doubt of the King's intentions, nor of the zeal of the nation, in our common cause.

His Prussian Majesty was pleased to order me to dine with him, and stayed longer at table than ordinary, conversed with great freedom and good humour, but took every occasion to shew his spleen against the French and his resentment at their conduct in the Empire. He told us that he hoped in eight or ten days to be master of Schweidnitz, as the garrison was too weak to defend it, and besides disgusted with having been shut up there so many months; that General Thierheim, who commanded in the place, seemed to be a brave man but very ignorant of the defence the place was capable of affording, and that he fired away his ammunition very unmeaningly; that he himself had been very ill served in the last siege and that his officers had not done their duty. It is impossible to give your Lordship an account of the strength His Prussian Majesty has in these parts, but it is certainly very considerable; the real state of the troops cannot well be ascertained

[1] This word has been scratched through several times, as if emphatically, in pencil.

till they take the field ; the regiments I have seen up on the road are in surprising good order and every moment is employed in exercising the recruits, which are very fine, and in preparing everything for action, as soon as Schweidnitz is surrendered. The snow is still deep in the mountains, so that the Austrians, however willing they might be (though they do not seem to have any notion of it), would find it next to impossible to attempt the relief of the besieged town. Their advanced posts are about two German miles from hence, on the Bohemian side of the mountains, and small skirmishes happen continually ; but the main body of their army is assembling about Königgrätz. The King of Prussia's advices, to which he seems to give credit, are that Marshal Daun has about 30,000 men with him, that about 7,000 more are under Marshal Nadasti in Moravia, and that not more than 3,000 were on the frontiers of Saxony. When he mentioned this enumeration of their force, I took the liberty to remark that they did not amount to above 40,000 men, to which the King of Prussia replied that he did not think them more at present, that they would be stronger when their recruits joined them, but that however powerful they might be thought, he defied them to produce the number of men they wanted ; that he should still have some work upon his hands, but that he hoped to get through it....

I have the honour to be [etc.]...

JOSEPH YORKE.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Holderness

[R. O. State Papers : Prussia.] Private.

LANDSHUT, *April 11th*, 1758.

[The King of Prussia had again made remonstrances on the subject of the recall of Mitchell.] "Je vous prie, Monsieur, de me dire, que pouvait faire votre ministre d'abord [dès] que je déclarais ne vouloir pas signer la Convention ; la faute était de mon côté, non du sien." [He wished General Yorke, on his way back to the Hague, to visit the Duke of Brunswick and bring him back to the support of the common cause, and made strong representations again on the importance and necessity of obtaining the Dutch.] Your Lordship will believe that I was very much pleased to find His Prussian Majesty in such good health and humour, because it is a good omen for our future proceedings with him ; indeed, I can't say enough of the gracious reception he has given me, nor of the free and cordial manner in which he has talked. He seems to have good hopes of at least keeping his enemies at bay....I have only to beg indulgence for the accounts I send. His Prussian Majesty's ideas are so extensive, and exprest in such good language, that I am sensible they will lose by passing through my pen....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Holderness

[R. O. State Papers : Prussia.] Separate and secret.

LANDSHUT IN THE MOUNTAINS OF SILESIA, *April 12th*, 1758.

MY LORD,

His Prussian Majesty was pleased to order me to attend him again this morning at Grüssau with Mr Mitchell, when he sent for us immediately into his room. He ordered us to sit down and, as what he thought fit to say appeared to me very material, I shall endeavour to give your Lordship as full an account of it as I can.

His Majesty opened himself by saying that since the conversation he had had with me the day before, in which he had received great satisfaction from the assurances I had given him, he had been thinking upon our situation, and that had made him desire me to come to him again to-day ; that it was disagreeable to reflect that, united as we were in one common cause, and with pretty near the same interests, we had seen our enemies acting upon a systematical plan, and guiding their operations to the execution of it, whilst we had been living from day to day, without any fixed system, or any particular plan of operations ; that what was past was past and he would say nothing about it, but that we should look forward, and do our utmost to reduce our enemies to reason, in which he would most heartily concur ; that for this purpose we should endeavour to negotiate with such Powers as were most likely to espouse our cause ; that we should not neglect any opportunity of gaining the Republic of Holland ; that their situation and their natural connection with England made them absolutely necessary in the forming of our system, and that now the French were drove out of the Empire, the situation of Flanders ought to be seriously considered ; that it might in time be possible to gain Sweden, and he thought we should endeavour to unite ourselves with them ; that perhaps Russia (tho' he owned that would be difficult) might in time be taken off ; that the King of Sardinia should be cultivated on the side of Italy ; and thus England, Prussia, Sardinia and Sweden with the Protestant Powers of Germany might form such a League as France and Austria would find it very difficult to get the better of.

Having laid down this as the groundwork of his system, he then proceeded to the manner of bringing it about ; and in this part of his conversation expatiated upon his idea of our operations. But first he asked me what we thought about the Low Countries, whether we held the same doctrine as had been followed since King William's time, or whether we were contented to see the maritime places in the hands of France, and the Dutch bridled to all eternity.—I answered, certainly not, that the possession of Ostend and Nieuport by the French and the cession of a part or all the Netherlands to France, was a direct violation of our treaties

with the House of Austria, and that tho' the circumstances of the war had not permitted our preventing what had happened, yet, united with His Majesty, we should be glad to know what his sentiments were in relation to them; that the cession of Flanders was meant as a reward to France for depriving His Prussian Majesty of a part of his dominions, and so far, he was as much interested in it as we. I added that from what I had observed, the neighbourhood of the French army had greatly intimidated the friends we had in Holland, and that the various events of the last campaign had kept people's minds in suspense, and made them uncertain what was the most prudent part to act; that perhaps the present situation of affairs might give an opening for something better, but that I foresaw, upon my return to the Hague, I should be much questioned as to the share His Prussian Majesty took in the leaving France in possession of any part of the Austrian Netherlands. To this the King of Prussia replied that he should interest himself in them just as much as we pleased; for that, if we chose to leave the French masters there, it was indifferent to him. As this declaration of indifference did not quite satisfy me as to what I wished to have his Prussian Majesty explain himself upon, viz. whether the French once fairly out of Germany, he would, if occasion offered, carry his arms still further against them, I came nearer to the point and insinuated that if it pleased God to crown us with success, France deserved to smart a little for her conduct in the Empire, and that a situation might offer in which it might be practicable to make them suffer in their turn. As he saw very soon where my questions led, he smiled, and asked me whether I had any doubt that he should be happy to have it in his power *de porter le flambeau aux portes de Paris, et pour apprendre à ces Messieurs ce que c'est que des procédés.* "I can assure you," continued His Majesty, "that I have no kind of backwardness in acting against France; and if I have any success in other parts, and can get a little elbow room, I shall with pleasure carry the war home to them. For the present, I have too much to do elsewhere, and will explain to you with pleasure my present plan. On this side I have collected a very large force, more than sufficient to cope with the Austrian army, tho' they will still be able to make head against me. It is necessary for me, however, first to clear Silesia of the garrison of Schweidnitz; and I am not sorry to keep my troops cantoned till the month of April is finished, long before which time I hope the town will be mine again[1]. My brother Henry[2] will have about 23,000 men against him, composed of the troops of the Empire and some Austrians; but as he has full 27,000 men in Saxony under him, tho' I do not give them out to be so many, I am not uneasy for his security. The Swedes at Stralsund, I foresee, will not be easy to force at present, since Marshal Lehwald delayed executing

[1] It capitulated on April 16th.

[2] p. 220 *n.*

my intentions, of passing over into the Isle of Rügen[1], whilst the waters were froze; to besiege it would be too hazardous, because I might be forced to raise the siege, and I would not choose to dishonour my armies by such an event. I reckon therefore that the Swedes, not being able to receive their reinforcements till June, the best thing for me will be to endeavour to lure them out of their stronghold by retiring before them, and when I get them out to march forward again and attack them. If I succeed in beating them, which from their conduct hitherto, I think I shall, your minister at Stockholm[2] will have a fine opening for a negotiation, and I desire nothing from them but to be as we were before. The next enemy is the Russian army, and at present I think I am fully informed of their project. The corps under General Fermer is to remain behind the Vistula, and for that purpose is fortifying itself at Thorn, Elbing, Marienwerder, and some other places. The other Corps, which is called the Legion, destined to march into this country, and for the speedy moving of which the Austrians are very pressing, as their chief resource, cannot be ready with their magazines and other necessaries till the end of June or the beginning of July. I propose, when they are well entered into Poland, to march an army likewise thither, and attack them at a distance from my frontiers; and I shall have a sufficient force left to act upon the defensive against the Austrians, in the meanwhile. If I succeed in taking off one of my enemies, or could be so happy, by the blow I meditate in particular against the Austrians (which His Majesty did not explain[3]), to reduce the Queen of Hungary to make a separate peace, I shall be very willing and desirous to go on further with England against France; but at present, as you see my enemies and know my force, or pretty near it, you must allow that I have not the number of men to do more; perhaps, towards autumn I may be able to do more, but till then I can't venture to promise anything.—

I thanked His Prussian Majesty very strongly for the confidence he was pleased to shew the King, in opening himself so freely and amply upon his designs, and in particular for those assurances he so positively made to me of his resolution to enter heartily into the

[1] Hans v. Lehwald (1685–1768) had especially distinguished himself in the Silesian War; governor of Königsberg 1757: defeated by the Russians the same year at Gross Jägerndorf and now disappointing F.'s expectations was superseded and made governor of Berlin.

[2] Sir John Goodrick, who accompanied General Yorke to the King of Prussia and who, Mitchell writes in ill humour, "the General told me, was a man of most excellent parts. The only proof I had of this [was] that the Knight seemed to be a humble admirer, and swore to everything the General said." (Add. 6867, f. 78.) Goodrick writes to Lord Royston (H. 77, f. 124) "I know from a third hand...that he [Frederick] is much pleased with the General; he told the above gentleman, "Je suis fort content d'avoir fait connaissance avec Mr Yorke, et je lui ai ouvert mon cœur." See also *Pol. Corr. F.'s* xvi. 373. On arriving in Sweden Goodrick was refused audience and recognition and returned.

[3] He did so in detail in a later interview, N. 194, f. 314.

war against France, than which nothing could bind him so firmly and effectually to England. This led me naturally to enquire what his opinion was as to the operations of the King's army under Prince Ferdinand, to which he said that, as yet, he should not attempt to pass the Rhine; for that, tho' he heartily wished to deliver his own dominions on that side, yet he thought it would be risking too much for the present; that if the Dutch could be brought to co-operate with us, that would change the question, because in that case, it would be absurd not to live in Flanders at the Empress Queen's expense; that the obliging the Courts of Vienna and Versailles to declare themselves upon the cessions made by one to another, and a security for the towns of the Barrier, was an argument that might very properly make the basis of a negotiation in Holland, and that he was ready to enter into any engagement with the King and the Republic for that purpose, and to be directed by them as to our conduct with regard to the Low Countries. He concluded upon this head by expressing his wishes that proper measures could be taken by augmenting the King's army to 50 or 55,000 men out of Lower Saxony, with which force, he said, we had nothing to fear, either from the gasconnades or attempts of the French.

Before the King of Prussia left the subject, he expatiated a little upon the method of carrying on the war against the French on that side; said that to take the bull by the horns by undertaking the attack of the French chain of forts, was an endless piece of work and would ruin us all before we had got half thro' it; but that he had considered the matter often, and he was of opinion that it would be no difficult matter to penetrate into France on the side of Luxemburg and leave the chain of fortresses behind; that by such an operation they would soon be made sick of the war, and be reduced to such terms as were necessary for the safety and repose of Europe. I found that he was firmly persuaded that Count Clermont had not above 35,000 men in all, and that the succours to be sent him could never make him 50,000. His Majesty supposes too that, to stop the clamours at Vienna, they will furnish money to the Russians, and think that as much as is necessary for fulfilling their engagements.

Before I conclude this letter, I must not omit to mention that His Prussian Majesty expressed his hopes that after the conduct of the Electors of Cologne and Palatine, they would be made to feel in their turn the weight of the war, and that Prince Ferdinand would be empowered to raise contributions in such of their dominions as he could come at. He took occasion to commend Prince Ferdinand's conduct, and said he had wrote him his thoughts very freely upon the plan of operations he thought he should follow.

I hope, my Lord, that His Majesty will be pleased with this account of the King of Prussia's way of talking[1]. Nothing could

[1] The better understanding and feeling between the two Kings was one of the chief objects of the mission.

be exprest with more zeal and warmth than all I have before related; and if it pleases God to bless his arms, I hope we shall see the latter part of his plan put in execution.

I have the honour to be [etc.]...

JOSEPH YORKE.

[Mitchell in some ill-humour gives an account in his diary of the same interview (Add. 6867, ff. 83 sqq.) and continues:] The King said our administration had done nothing all last year, but he approved much of the vigorous measures they were now pursuing; he added, "Mr Mitchell has urged me very much at different times to persuade me to desist from the measure of sending English troops upon the continent, but I have insisted upon it for your good and as a right measure." Upon this Mr Yorke said that he had wrote volumes upon the same subject, but that the administration had not taken offence at what he wrote. At dinner the King talked of the French and of the battle of Fontenoy: the relation Mr Yorke made of that battle did not agree with the accounts His Majesty had had of it. The King desired us to dine with him again the next day.

In the coach, Mr Yorke did not seem to be in good humour, nor much edified with the conversation. He said he believed Prince Ferdinand was as good a general as the King of Prussia, and to prove it, quoted a saying of Mr Pitt's,—*There must be more than one general in Europe*....

13*th*. General Yorke showed me his public letters giving an account of the audiences...and carefully avoided saying anything of our inaction in the year 1757, nor of the measure of sending English troops, though the King of Prussia spoke out very plainly upon both....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 237.] LANDSHUT IN THE MOUNTAINS OF SILESIA, *April* 13*th*, 1758.

MY LORD,...

My messenger met me again at Lüben on the 8th instant, and with him a Chasseur of the King of Prussia, to direct me to this place and to provide horses and quarters upon the road. Accordingly, we went thro' Liegnitz and Jauer, which is at the foot of the mountains. The next day, the 9th, we set forward at 4 o'clock in the morning; and tho' we had but about 30 English miles to go, from the badness of the roads and the difficulties of passing thro' the mountains, we could not arrive by the way of Reichenau to Landshut before half an hour after 3 in the afternoon. Here I found Mr Mitchell, who was just come from the King of Prussia with orders that I should attend him the next morning, when I accordingly went.

I found the King at Grüssau, a Convent about 5 miles from this place. He received me very graciously and without any ceremony, kept me two hours alone, and talk'd very fairly and civilly on all that had passed, and was very ample in his justification of Mr Mitchell and very strong in his desire to keep him[1].... I must humbly beg leave to refer your Lordship to the long letters I have wrote to the office[2]....I will only say therefore in general that, as far as it is permitted one to judge or to dive into the thoughts of a great monarch, His Prussian Majesty seems fully determined to adhere to his alliance with England, and to concert both war and peace with us. He has explained himself as fully as can be desired in regard to France, and desires nothing so much as to find an opportunity to retaliate upon that Power all the evil they have made others suffer, and if it pleases God to bless his arms this campaign, I think it won't be his fault if he don't keep his word[3].

It was remarkable enough that in the three days' conversation I have had the honour to have with him, tho' he has exprest to several persons his perfect and entire satisfaction with me, yet he never insinuated the most distant hint as if he wished I should stay with him, in case he could not keep Mr Mitchell; but on the contrary, always talked of my return to the Hague, thought it of very great importance and rather thought I should not lose time, has opened himself upon his way of thinking about Holland, without my beginning, and has pressed me particularly to go by Brunswick in my way thither[4]....

I would willingly give your Lordship some idea of His Prussian Majesty because it is natural you should expect it from me, but I am afraid I shall make but a lame description. None of the pictures or medals I have ever seen of him are in the least like him. He looks in good health and spirits and eats heartily. His height is about 5 foot 8 inches. He wears his own hair which is easily and naturally dressed. His forehead is high and handsome, he has a good nose and mouth, and his side face is a striking likeness of Princess Amalia. It is astonishing what a quantity of Spanish snuff he takes and how he daubs himself with it; his face, coat, ruffles, hands, are all dyed with it, and he must swallow a prodigious quantity at his meals. He wears a close blue great coat with velvet sleeves and cape of the same colour. That he has at present is full of holes upon one flap and, to be sure, the

[1] "This audience lasted an hour and a half and I do not know what passed, for the General gave me no account,...but he seemed not pleased that His Majesty had talked so much and suffered him to say so little." Mitchell's Diary, Add. 6867, f. 83.

[2] Above to Lord Holderness of April 12th, and another of April 13th, R. O.; S. P. Prussia.

[3] Cf. Frederick to Knyphausen in London, May 21: "J'ai déjà flatté le Sieur Yorke par l'idée que, quand nous aurions préalablement fini avec les Autrichiens ici, nous pourrions alors réunir nos forces pour tomber sur la France" (*Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvii. 26).

[4] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xvi. 391.

whole not worth five shillings; the Eagle in the Star upon his breast is loose and looks like flying away. He wears his sash round his waist constantly, and the same sword that all the army wears. His table is a very frugal one. I have dined at it now three times and very well; but it consists in a soup and three dishes at first course and four at second, without any dessert or any ostentation. He loves to sit long at table and converse, which he does with great freedom and spirit, and is as entertaining as possible; has a surprising memory, and as clear in his narration as a man can be; I believe when he is displeased he can say very sharp things, but, as I have only had the good fortune to see him in good humour, I can truly say that he appears in an amiable light. He talks with a good deal of feeling for mankind, tho' he leads so many where they feel; and has studied the medicinal parts of the service as much as if he was a physician of his own hospitals. His quarters are quite quiet without any noise or hurly-burly[1]. Everything moves like clockwork, and no wonder, as he directs it all himself. We passed not far from Schweidnitz in coming here; the fire was very hot that day, but it has since decreased and the cannon of the town almost all silenced... ; and by the King's account 8 or 10 days will put an end to the affair[2]....The troops are very fine, and look well and satisfied. They have a great many sick, to the amount of 15,000, but His Majesty says that diminishes. It is very cold here; the mountains are cover'd with snow and it froze very hard last night, so that till next month, I suppose, they will hardly encamp. The mountains are well-cultivated and peopled, and great manufactures in all parts of them; indeed, the whole Duchy of Silesia is as fine a country as one can see and well worth fighting for, and the inhabitants of it beautiful; out of England I never saw so handsome a race of people as the Silesians, very different from their neighbours in Brandenburg and Bohemia, who are very plain.

I have not time to add any more....

JOSEPH YORKE.

[The Chancellor sent this letter to the King on April 22, who replied:]

I thank you my Ld. for communicating this Letter wch I think both instructif and entertaining.

G. R.

[1] Several words are here completely erased by a later hand.

[2] It capitulated April 16th, H. 16, f. 308; J. Y. to Holderness, April 19th, R. O.; S. P. Prussia.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 243.] NEUSTADT IN SILESIA, *April 27th*, 1758.

...I think the King of Prussia is as firm to us as he is active against his enemies. He told me today in my ear, as I sat by him at dinner, that if we would but stick to one another, we should soon make the French and Austrians weary of the war, as they began to be already of one another. I answer'd that I made no doubt of it, and that he might depend upon us, as we did upon him. After dinner, he told me all his plan[1]....He is indeed very gracious and obliging, and at times very communicative. To be sure, as to everything political that is to be done more, there is nothing, and the King of Prussia is always talking of my going back to the Hague....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to Lady Anson

[H. 41, f. 55.] HEADQUARTERS AT LITTAU, *May 6th*, 1758.

...In this situation and uncertainty, I can assure you that nothing but the goodness of the great Prince I am following could have comforted me; for to follow an army, without having anything to do in it, is such a new thing to me that I can't describe to you the *ennui* it has given me. Thank God, however, our hero has succeeded in his design of getting down into this country, without his enemies knowing anything of it, and we are actually within sight of Olmütz and have crossed the most difficult river I have ever seen, without any loss or stop, except that of some hundreds of Hussars, who waited in this place the ceremony of a few cannon shot to leave us masters of the passage. We are at present got into a more reasonable climate; the sun shines and warms us[2]....

I wish I was capable of drawing a good picture of the great Prince I have had the honour to dine with, ever since the 25th of last month; his urbanity, resolution, sagacity and perseverance surpass anything I had ever formed an idea of; and if he has but half the success he deserves, his enemies will fall before him like sheep....

Copie de la Lettre du Roi de Prusse au Roi d'Angleterre, pour servir de Lettre de Récréance au Général Major Yorke

[H. 9, f. 245.]

AU QUARTIER DE KLEIN LATHEIN, ce 9^{e} *de Juin* 1758.

Monsieur mon Frère, Votre Majesté vient de me donner une marque des plus agréables de son Amitié par la Mission Extraordinaire dont elle a bien voulu m'honorer dans la personne de son

[1] J. Y. to Lord Holderness of same date, N. 194, f. 314.

[2] Gen. Yorke writes on the same date and on May 14th, 21st, 28th and June 5th to Lord Holderness, describing the movements and plans of the Prussian army and the siege of Olmütz. R. O.; S. P. Prussia.

Général Major le Sieur de Yorke. Ce Ministre s'est acquitté de sa Commission à ma satisfaction entière et d'une manière qui lui fait beaucoup d'honneur. Je me flatte que Votre Majesté sera également contente du rapport que le Sieur de Yorke lui fera sur les entretiens qu'il a eu[s] avec moy, et des dispositions dans lesquelles il m'a trouvé pour rendre nos liaisons communes de plus en plus durables et efficaces, n'ayant rien plus à cœur que de convaincre Votre Majesté de la vérité de ces sentiments d'amitié et d'estime toute particulière, avec lesquels Je suis

Monsieur, mon Frère,

de Votre Majesté

le bon Frère,

F[R]ÉDÉRIC.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Holderness

[R. O.; S. P. Prussia.] Secret. BRESLAU, *June 14th*, 1758.

[The King of Prussia expressed his satisfaction at the assurances sent by the King], "Affairs," continued His Majesty, "look favourably for us at present; but I don't forget that they did so last year likewise; and therefore, I am for taking advantage of them whilst they are prosperous. I can assure you that my resolution is firm, and that I am determined to continue unchangeable in my alliance with England; it is more agreeable to me than any other, and of this I give you my word of honour. I own to you that I shall be glad to make peace when I can; but I will not think of it whilst England has not her advantages, and security too in America, as well as Europe, nor unless we can make our enemies come into such a peace as may be durable; my situation and circumstances will not admit of my going to war every day, and making a truce instead of a peace; my loss is too heavy in subjects and revenues for such a system, and therefore I labour hard to make the war short, by distressing our enemies as much as I can. The Empress Queen is not satisfied with the conduct of France towards her, and particularly with the insinuations which have been made by that Power at Vienna, of being mediators for her in obtaining a peace. This is not an agreeable prospect for her Imperial Majesty, and may possibly incline her to a separate peace which I shall very readily come into; I have no desire to be at variance with that Princess, provided she does not assume too great a superiority; upon an equality, I will be her friend tomorrow; but I must not put myself into a situation to be led by the Austrians, for then I should be dependent and could be of no use to myself nor others; as things are at present circumstanced, I think we have nothing else to do but to put a good face upon it, and reject all offers that are made separately, as I have done already and I know you have

too, and by following that method, we shall come to our point; we should treat all offers as made in common and we shall, by such a conduct, weary out our enemies; we should never appear eager for peace, nor never highly reject the propositions made us; jealousy by this means will increase amongst them, and we may reasonably hope to be soon upon a footing to settle a peace to our own satisfaction and for our own security." His Prussian Majesty then entered into the situation of Holland, and declared that he thought we should at all events endeavour to gain the Republic; that they were necessary for consolidating our system, and particularly for keeping open the communication between him and England...and that he gave me full power to act for him, as the circumstances required...that if he could carry his point on this side, he would with pleasure carry the war home to France....

In this situation and temper I left His Prussian Majesty and... from the whole turn of his conversation and conduct, I am convinced the King may depend upon the hearty support and concurrence of the King of Prussia....He desires not to dictate the method of carrying on the war; all he desires from England is to distress and embarrass France[1]....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 249.] BRESLAU, *June 14th*, 1758.

MY LORD,

I did not receive the honour of your Lordship's letter of the 11th May till the 10th instant, as the messenger was obliged to keep pace with the head of a convoy of 9,000 waggons, which were escorted from Silesia into the plains of Moravia....There are many circumstances in this commission that have been amusing and instructive, but there are likewise many others that do not make it a desirable one. It is not everybody that can hit the proper manner to please such a man as the King of Prussia, and the living constantly with, and under the eye of, such a Prince exposes one to many things which don't happen in any other foreign commission. I have had the good luck (and I confess there is a great deal in it) to almost eat, drink and sleep with him for upwards of two months without a rub; and I can't say enough of his politeness and goodness to me, nor of the gracious manner in which he dismissed me. He told me at parting—*Monsieur, je vous vois partir avec regret, et j'aurai[s] été charmé de vous garder et de jouir de votre compagnie, mais je garderai toujours le souvenir agréable d'avoir fait la connaissance d'un homme aussi estimable et aussi aimable que vous êtes.* His Majesty likewise sent me a copy of his letter to the King, and ordered Mons. Eichel to acquaint me that he was sorry he was not in a position to give me a mark of his favour with his own hand, but that he had ordered his picture to be given me as I went thro'

[1] See also official and private letters of same date, S. P. Prussia.

Berlin. He, besides this, gave me the command and absolute direction of my escort, which was a battalion, two pieces of cannon and a detachment of Hussars as far as Troppau, where I arrived the 11th at night, without having occasion to signalise myself with His Majesty's troops, the light troops of the enemy, which were upon our road, not caring to venture too near us, but contented themselves with seeing us pass at a distance....I shall set out again tomorrow morning for Berlin....

I hope and think you will be pleased with the King of Prussia's sentiments. He wants to shorten the war, but he would not hurry up the peace; but has told me that, upon his honour, he will not make peace with France unless we are secured and satisfied in America as well as Europe, and that of all the men he had seen, he would not choose to deceive me, because I had behaved so much *en militaire, et avec tant de candeur.* He desires this may be his last war, and therefore would not make patch-work of the peace; and he thinks, if we keep a good countenance and are not too much elated or depressed, that we shall soon have safe and honourable terms from our enemies.

...I am glad your Lordship stood up for your profession against the cavillers[1]. The King of Prussia would approve it, if he understood the *Habeas Corpus*; but he has no idea at all of our complicated interior, tho' he has been often very inquisitive about particular points. He is, upon the whole, very well satisfied with us, and hates France more and more every day; but he can't despise their troops more than he does already....

[On the overleaf of this letter Lord Hardwicke has written in pencil the following subjects, on which to write to his son :—]

1. Q. King of Pr.'s situation?
2. Siege of Olmütz?
3. Whether appears melancholy and low at times?
4. The apprehensions of people about him?
5. The fate and case of the Prince of Bevern?[2]
6. Eyes. Picture set with diamonds?

On June 16th and 18th, and July 4th, 1758 (H. 69, ff. 229, 232 and 242), the Duke of Newcastle writes to Lord Hardwicke on the subject of the expeditions against the coast of France, strongly supported by Pitt but opposed by the Duke*.

[1] See pp. 6 sqq.

[2] See p. 227.

* The Duke of Newcastle objected to these expeditions in order to facilitate sending troops to Prince Ferdinand; otherwise it would have been much better not to have squabbled with Lord Chatham on those points. H.

Lord Anson to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 11, f. 410.] [Endorsed by Lord Hardwicke.]

ROYAL GEORGE AT SEA...*supposed to be dated June 29th*, 1758[1].

MY DEAR LORD,

I had the honour of your Lordship's very kind and obliging letter of the 21st instant, which was of the latest date and one of the first I received in a month, tho' I had sent five times to Plymouth, expecting letters from thence, it being the only place for Cleveland[2] to keep up a correspondence with me.

Sir Edward Hawke was certainly very ill when he left me, a good deal occasioned by the uneasiness of his mind from his own late conduct which, with the assistance of Holburne[3], and a very bad man his secretary, had done much mischief in the Fleet.

I think and hope Admiral Saunders[4] will soon be in England in whom I could confide for keeping the fleet in such discipline, that I should have a pleasure in going on board it, whenever there should be a necessity. I have desired Captain Holmes may be made a Rear Admiral, and sent out to me[5]. I am glad you are all agreed to approve the late project as well as the execution[6]; for I think any difference in opinion at this time would hurt the King's affairs. I shall therefore never mention anything of my opinion about it but to your Lordship. By Commander Howe's[7] letter to me, he was greatly surprised at receiving the Duke of Marlborough's order to re-embark the troops so suddenly. Howe afterwards wanted them to land at Granville, where he undertook to put them safe on shore, which the Generals declined and proposed to him to send the bomb vessels in to bombard the town, which he refused, thinking it too ridiculous an operation for such an armament, in which, I think, he judged right. Certainly your army does not make the figure it ought to do. At Virginia they were beat by the Indians; in other parts of America, tho' you have changed your

[1] Sir Edward Hawke had struck his flag without orders on hearing that Capt. Howe had been given the naval command of the new expedition. He apologized to the Board but was dismissed, and in consequence Lord Anson was himself obliged to go to sea, Sir Edward Hawke serving under him. H. 11, ff. 393, 403; J. S. Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War*, i. 268.

[2] Secretary to the Admiralty.

[3] Francis Holburne (1704–71), rear-admiral, had been a member of Byng's court martial, and lately had failed miserably in the attempt against Louisburg, p. 116.

[4] Charles Saunders (*c.* 1713–75); had formerly served under Anson; now comptroller of the Navy; M.P. for Heydon; later commander-in-chief of the fleet in the St Lawrence and conqueror, with Wolfe, of Quebec; K. B. 1761.

[5] Captain Charles Holmes (1711–61).

[6] *I.e.* to make the best of it.

[7] Richard, 4th Viscount, and afterwards 1st Earl Howe (1726–99), another of Anson's captains; commander of the squadron during the unfortunate attempt on St Malo and Cherbourg; afterwards greatly distinguished himself, notably at Quiberon Bay (1759) and Gibraltar (1782) and June 1st, 1794.

generals, you have lost part of your possessions and forts without ever making any tolerable defence; at Rochefort your generals saw men upon the hills and, tho' they knew there was no regular troops in the country, they would not land; at St Malo's they have found hedges and ditches; what ground would your troops choose to act upon; I should not wish it to be upon our own, tho' I believe the men to be good and the generals brave; therefore can account for their conduct no otherwise than by their feeling a want of experience in themselves, which makes them fearful of coming into action or putting anything to the risk, which must be done in all operations of war, where success can never be certain. Mr Pitt said everything possible to his generals to make them risk action with the French troops, therefore political reasons only can make him approve. Our only remaining hope is from Louisburg; there, I think, we must succeed, as no supplies of troops or provisions have been thrown into the place. I beg my most affectionate compliments to Lady Hardwicke and all the family, and that you will believe me, my dear Lord, your ever dutiful and affectionate servant,

ANSON.

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke at the Hague

[N. 196, f. 187.] KENSINGTON, *July 7th*, 1758.

DEAR SIR,

I rejoice to hear (and so does the King) that you are safely returned to the Hague. His Majesty with reason (for you have used him to it) expects great things from you. First a continuation of your most valuable intelligence...and particularly, the King would be glad to be informed what the French said and thought of the marvellous passage of the Rhine by Prince Ferdinand in sight almost of their armies, and also of the ardour and bravery of His Majesty's troops there and at the late most glorious battle at Crefeld, and all the particulars you can learn relating to that great action[1]....Add to this, that 9,000 British troops (the best I hope in Europe, both horse and foot) are going under *a* Duke of Marlborough to join Prince Ferdinand's army. If this will not do, nothing will. You see what time brings about....But we must not brag too much....Your Father is excellent, and I am,

Dear Joe, Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. Write to me frequently. It will not be the worse either for you or for me.

[1] Gained by Prince Ferdinand on June 23rd. Nothing gave the King so much pleasure as the achievements of the Hanoverian troops, and to hear them praised.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 16, f. 313.] HAGUE, *July 7th*, 1758.

DEAR BROTHER,

...To be sure my expedition has turned out very fortunately for me, but I can't say I am sorry to be got home again for, excepting the monarch himself, who is a great and amiable man, I don't know three people in his army who are sociable, or with whom there is any possibility of conversing. The education of the greatest part of them is very confined, and they are so sensible of it that it makes them shy and reserved towards foreigners, so that any lights you desire to procure, you must fish out for yourself; for otherwise, you run a risk of never getting them. The nature of the service and the manner of performing it is much the same as elsewhere, and not better than with us or the Hanoverians; and indeed, if I was to choose, I should prefer the two last in many respects. The niceties of the service, which I had heard so much of, I did not find, so that the whole difference resides in the person of the Chief, whose activity and attention goes so far, that a detachment of 1000 men never goes out of his camp that he is not along with it; and under him the worst soldiers would become the best. This is the true state of the case without disguise, and that makes the sight I have seen still more curious and singular....Considering the situation I left His Prussian Majesty in, I am not uneasy at all the puffing accounts of the Austrians....

Lord Anson to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 11, f. 413.] ROYAL GEORGE OFF PLYMOUTH, *July 22nd*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD,

...Tho' I don't think the affairs of the Admiralty go on the better for my absence, I had not the least thoughts of leaving the chief command of the fleet, while any operations are carrying on against the enemy....The command of a squadron at sea has always been my principal object and passion, and tho' possibly nothing extraordinary in a military service may come in the way of this fleet, I have the satisfaction myself to know that I am rendering very material service both to the King and public in putting this squadron into a different state of discipline to whatever it has been in yet. This I only mention to your Lordship, because it would look like vanity in me and a reflection on those who have had the command of it. I do assure your Lordship, when I began to exercise my fleet, I never saw such an awkwardness in going thro' the common manœuvres necessary to make an attack on any enemy's fleet at all; what we now do in an hour, in the beginning took us eight, which convinces me that men never do anything well that they are not accustomed to and frequently practised in. The

captains excused themselves, and were ashamed to find how little they knew of their duty in a fleet, and most of them declared they had never seen a line of battle at all, and none of them more than once. This convinces me of the necessity of having somebody under me, upon whom I can depend for keeping the fleet in good order and in a condition for service when it shall be wanted, if I am to command it....I think your news from North America promises success, tho' they [*i.e.* the French] have troops and six large ships got into the Port, which will make the taking of it of much more consequence; but it puzzles me to account for their getting in there[1]. I shall sail early tomorrow morning; for nothing can be more disagreeable to a commanding officer than being a few days in port, in a constant hurry to get the ships equipped and ready for the seas....I am much disappointed in not having had some news from the King of Prussia....

I am, my dear Lord, [etc.]

ANSON.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 261.] HAGUE, *July 31st*, 1758.

MY LORD,

I am afraid when I left London, in the month of March last, that I promised your Lordship some particulars relating to the King of Prussia, which might not properly make a part of my official despatches....My ideas of His Prussian Majesty, before I had the honour to approach him, were a little different from what they were afterwards. He had been represented to me as a man who disguised his sentiments, who was very violent, and who took frequent opportunities of shewing his contempt of others. I found him very different; open in his conversation, sometimes even to indiscretion, discovering in his countenance the least thing that ruffled him, very quick but not at all passionate, extremely decent in his conversation upon other people's subject, and affecting the greatest tenderness and indulgence when he spoke of other Princes or their ministers. It gave me great pleasure to find him so much delighted to be reconciled to the King. He complained to me of the arts that had been used to keep them from being friends, and turned the conversation in several shapes at different times, in order to find out whether I was really convinced that His Majesty had a good opinion of him and was satisfied with his conduct and behaviour. He did the same by Major Marwitz[2], tho' in a less covered manner; and when, upon enquiry, he thought himself certain of the fact, he expressed himself in the strongest terms

[1] The conquest of Louisburg and Cape Breton took place July 27th.

[2] Probably Gustav Ludwig v. der Marwitz, born 1730, afterwards general; gained the order of merit for his conduct at Rosbach.

upon the pleasure he received from these assurances, and declared to me, in the warmth of his heart, that the present alliance was much more to his taste, as well as to that of his subjects, than his former one with France; that he had languished for it, but that whilst we had adhered so warmly to the Court of Vienna, he had not known how to do better than to unite with that of Versailles. The impertinent behaviour of the latter towards him at the beginning of these troubles helped to alienate him a good deal from their interests. Among other instances, he mentioned one to me, which is singular enough to be preserved. After the news came of Admiral Boscawen's having taken the two ships in North America[1], and that the war was determined in France, Mons. Rouillé[2] sent for Mons. de Knyphausen[3] and told him, in the French King's name, that they had a proposal to make His Prussian Majesty, which would be very advantageous to him, and could not fail of advancing their common interests, which was for His Prussian Majesty to fall upon the Electorate of Hanover and raise contributions there, for that there was money enough in that country to make it worth his while, with several expressions which tended to show how much they thought the view of pecuniary interest alone would sway with the King of Prussia. He says that he felt himself hurt with this kind of treatment and that he had ordered his Minister in his own hand to tell Mons. Rouillé, "that if they had any such intention, they might attempt it themselves; that for his part he had no quarrel with his Uncle and would be guilty of no such injustice; that he had never passed for a robber, nor a plunderer, and that he supposed they looked upon him as a near relation of Mandrin's[4], since they dared to make such a proposal to him." This passed before the treaty with England was signed, after which they tried every way to soothe him; but he had discovered so long before their dealings with the House of Austria and their intrigues with Kaunitz, that he determined to break off all connexion with them as fast as he could. Ever since that time the French have treated him in so trifling a manner, as a Prince they were determined *to chastise*, that his spleen was turned from Vienna to Versailles, tho' his apprehensions are with reason still confined to the former....He has not, I am convinced, the least intercourse with them; for to this minute no regulation has even been proposed in relation to the prisoners, which he took at the Battle of Rosbach.

This Prince affects a great familiarity in his manner of conversing, at the same time that he preserves his dignity; and nothing can be better bred or more engaging than his address. His great pleasure is in conversation, and it is indeed the only amusement or

[1] See vol. ii. 257.

[2] Antoine Louis Rouillé, Comte de Jouy (1689–1761), became foreign minister in 1754.

[3] Then Prussian minister at Paris.

[4] Louis Mandrin (1725–55), chief of a band of smugglers and freebooters in France; at length captured and broken on the wheel.

relaxation he takes in the field, tho' he sometimes carries it to excess; for as he sits down commonly to dinner between eleven and twelve, he spins out the time for five or six hours and sometimes longer, during which time he never ceases talking upon all topics, serious and pleasant; and during the whole time I had the honour to attend him, I can't say that I ever saw him out of spirits or out of humour. He has a fund of anecdotes which he has picked up from all the persons he has seen, which he applies properly and which show a surprising memory. Besides this, he has a smattering, more or less, of all sciences, so that he is never at a loss upon any subject which happens to be started. One thing surprised me a great deal, and that was the silence his brothers[1] observe when they are at table with him; for, unless he addresses himself immediately to them, they never open their lips, but sit by him in the most respectful silence, whilst other people are talking familiarly, which makes it the more remarkable; especially as in their correspondence with him, which I have several times seen, they never make use of any higher style in addressing him than *Mon très cher Frère*, nor he to them.

His dress is that of his whole army; in general, a blue coat faced with red and white buttons; but from time to time he puts on the regimentals of his first battalion of Guards, which are very rich. It is seldom, however, that he finds the weather warm enough to go without his surtout, which is a close one, made of blue cloth, without any ornament, except blue velvet sleeves and collar. He wears his sash always round his waist, and it is in this dress that he appears the best; for, as he is pretty thick about the hips and has a hollow back, this dress fills it up and hides the defects of his shape. Notwithstanding this sensibility of cold, he never gets into a coach, but constantly marches on horseback with his infantry, begins his march with them and leads them into camp or quarters. As we had some excessive cold weather during our march into Moravia, he saw me one day marching with the troops on foot in order to keep myself warm, when he expressed great envy at it and said he would try if he could do the same; but after he had walked about three quarters of an hour, he was obliged to get on horseback again, being quite tired from the weakness of his tendons, which has remained ever since his last fit of the gout. He formerly used to encamp with the army, but in this war he has always quartered; because he is subject to profuse sweats which make him liable to take cold, if he gets out of bed in a damp place. He and Marshal Keith are the only officers of the army who are lodged, the rest all encamp.

His table is a very neat and frugal one, partly by his order, and more so by the little attention he pays to it; insomuch as I have

[1] August Wilhelm, Prince of Prussia (1722–58), married Louise, da. of Ferdinand Albert, duke of Brunswick, and died this year. Heinrich (1726–1802), married Wilhelmine, da. of the Elector of Hesse-Cassel; and August Ferdinand (1730–1813), married Anne, da. of Friedrich Wilhelm, margrave of Brandenburg-Schwedt.

frequently seen the whole dinner eat up and those, who had the honour to assist, rise from it in the manner recommended by the physicians to preserve health and long life. The number of dishes never exceeded eight in two courses of four each, whilst I attended him, and those not of any size or delicacy, tho' we were frequently from fourteen to eighteen persons to feed upon them. He eats heartily and drinks a great quantity of wine and water, small champagne and French white wine. He invites his own company; for as soon as he has given the orders to the army, he looks round to see what officers are there, and sends a page to tell them to dine with him. His equipage is a moderate one, if considered as that of a King, but a very decent one as the general of an army. He has about 12 or 14 livery servants, besides four pages and those in the stables; but all those who are in livery, not belonging to the horses, are obliged to walk on foot and carry a fowling piece upon their shoulder; for he says they are better able to walk on foot than the soldiers, as their baggage is carried for them, and they are better provided for at the end of their march. He rides none but English horses, and has none other in his stables for his person. He has ten or twelve with him at present; they are large hunters, whose motions are a little rough, which he likes better than easy ones, from custom and long use. He rises at five and goes to bed at nine, unless in extraordinary cases, and sleeps very well. He makes but one meal, and drinks two dishes of coffee in the morning. I took the liberty to ask His Majesty one day if it was true that he had made so free with coffee formerly. He said that it was, and that it had been one of the many follies of his youth to imagine that a man might live with little or no sleep, and that it was so much of life lost; that in order to prevent drowsiness he had drank as far as 40 dishes of strong coffee a day, as well as all other heating liquors, and that he had so far succeeded that he had very near died of it, and that it had cost him and his physicians near three years to bring himself to a proper habit of body again. As soon as he rises, he sends for Mr Eichel[1] and despatches all business which is to be expedited abroad, and is always dressed ready for the parade of his guard, which is only of an officer and 18 men, which he regularly assists at. As soon as that is over, he gets on horseback and rides to the camp, visits the posts and the avenues and returns back to his quarters about eleven o'clock, which is the hour when the orders are given out.

This much will suffice to give your Lordship an idea of this Prince's private life in the field, if I may so call it. I will proceed next to give you some particulars relative to his army and the conduct of it.

Of all the objects I saw at the Prussian camp, what struck me most was the King of Prussia himself; for tho' he may, and certainly has, many good officers under him, yet I saw none that

[1] August Friedrich Eichel, privy councillor and secretary to Frederick.

approached him in their military skill nor anything more than I was used to see in other armies....The only very superior point of discipline I observed among the Prussians, which I had not seen elsewhere, was that, whenever the army marched thro' a small town and that by any embarras any part of the line was obliged to halt in the town, I never saw a soldier quit his rank, tho' I have seen a halt last above an hour at a time. ' It is true that the same regulation is established in all other services; but this is the only one I have yet seen where it is rigidly observed.

The captains both of horse and foot are obliged to keep a table for their subalterns, and the King gives an extraordinary gratification for that purpose during the campaign. By this means the young officers are constantly under the eye of their superiors, have no pretence for absenting themselves, and have nothing to attend to but their duty; whilst quarrels, caballing and all other inconveniences of too many young men messing together are avoided, of which I have myself seen many bad effects in other armies.

The Prussian soldiers never carry their tent-poles, a regulation I should be glad to see established in our service; but they are carried along with the tents upon bât-horses. Several inconveniences are avoided by this, such as the soldiers fastening their poles to their fire-locks and being upon any surprise embarrassed to handle their arms; and in case of a retreat before an enemy after an action, the men are not obliged to lie without cover upon the ground for want of tent-poles to pitch their tents, which is, and must always be, the case with us whenever we lose a field of battle, as the men must throw down their poles whenever they are to engage.

The Prussians always have their picket-guards lie out at the head of their camp and in the rear, and a double chain of sentries are placed all round the camp who give the word from one to another all night, and the guards in villages observe the same method.

No detachments are ever made in the Prussian service by men of different corps, but always by whole corps or in proportion from one corps, as the numbers are demanded; so that the officers are always with their own men; and this rule is observed in the horse as well as the foot and seems to be a more rational method than that observed in other services, where the men of all corps are mixed together, and frequently the men and officers never saw each other and may never meet again, which is subject to a great many inconveniences.

The King is very attentive to have his soldiers well furnished with everything necessary and I really think, the whole considered, that they are better in that service than in any other, provided they can accustom themselves to the confinement of never stirring out of sight of their officers, without an under-officer with them. The foot are clothed every year, and the clothes are not so very short as they used to be; they have likewise a small mounting in the

summer of linen breeches and other little particulars which preserves their warmer things for the winter season, so, that, when I left them, the troops looked as if they had just marched out of Berlin and Potzdam. In all the last campaign, notwithstanding the losses he sustained of magazines and dominions and the prodigious tract of country he marched over, the army never wanted bread a moment; and with that attention and the oxen, which he provides for every regiment and which march along with them, they run no risk of starving. In the fine weather, he gives beef twice a week to the men, and in the bad, four times. Besides this, salt is always carried for them and brandy; and when the water of the camp proves to have the least bad quality, the men are obliged to mix a certain quantity of vinegar with it, which is likewise carried along with the army at the King's expense. Besides these attentions and many others for the men, he never fatigues them unnecessarily, so that, when they have once learned their exercise, which they do quicker there than anywhere else, they have nothing to do but their ordinary duty, as he never exercises or reviews them in the field, after the first month of the campaign is over, unless by way of punishment, when he remarks any relaxation of their discipline.

This sort of punishment too is the only one almost which he can accustom himself to, except the ordinary one with the cane; for he cannot bring himself to condemn a man to death, for which the army must often suffer by the liberties the men take to plunder in the villages when they go for straw or water. The officers complain of this as a weakness in His Majesty, which they compare with the severity of Marshal Schwerin's discipline, whose camp, by that means, was always abundantly provided. The King himself several times in conversation condemned himself for it, but confessed his weakness and said his enemies had done him and his subjects so much mischief, that he could not take upon himself to be revenging the death of every fowl or pig that was taken away.

I forgot to mention one more punishment or rather mark of infamy, which a corps is threatened with when it has not done well before the enemy, and that is to wear cloth buttons instead of metal, which is so much dreaded in the army that regiments have done next to impossibilities to recover their reputation. His Majesty has with reason the confidence of his troops, for they are sure to see him always with them; and upon a march he mixes in the ranks and converses freely with the men, and learns their private histories. Besides, no detachment of any consequence, not even of a thousand men, goes out from camp which he does not accompany; and I admired, when I had the honour to accompany him in some excursions he made to clear the approaches to his camp of the enemy's parties, how quick he is in judging his ground and how cautious he is not to risk too far, when he has gained an advantage, for fear of discouraging the men and depriving them of that notion they have of their superiority over their enemies. He is very far,

however, from having a contempt for the Austrians but the contrary; and I heard him several times call to his officers and bid them take notice of what the enemy did well, in order to learn from it.

The most formidable enemy he has to fight with are the Croats, commonly called the Pandours, who are a hardy, brave people, faithful to their Sovereign and indefatigable. There is no instance of their deserting and not only that, but they prevent the regular troops from getting away likewise. His Majesty has by dint of pains and precautions got the better of the apprehensions his troops had of them; and by giving them no quarter in the two last campaigns, he has reduced them to be more civilised this. He owned to me he was more upon his guard against them than against any other troops, and that he hoped I did not believe he had that contempt for them that he expressed; but that he had found no other way to inspire a confidence into his troops than by treating them as *canaille*, or the lowest of soldiers; that it was impossible for him to oppose anything equal to them in that kind, and that he did not like to be always sacrificing his regular infantry in that kind of war; that he had therefore raised a number of free battalions, but that did not suffice, nor were they anything to compare in goodness; but that was the only resource he had against them, except his artillery, of which they were much afraid.

I did not find His Majesty so well served in spies, as I imagined he might be, which, he says, is owing to his making war in the enemy's country and therefore liable to be deceived, as the inhabitants are against him. He has no other remedy for this but to push large corps of troops forward as near the enemy as possible in order to see with his own eyes their position. For this purpose, in the beginning of the campaign, he names a certain number of battalions and squadrons to the amount of 16 or 17 thousand men, who form the vanguard of the army, and with whom he always marches in person. This force is sufficient to enable him to maintain a post till his army can join him, and in the meanwhile he makes himself master of the advantages and disadvantages of the country round about. When this vanguard moves, he marches with the van of that and chooses himself every camp that is taken and waits till the infantry is come in, before which he never goes to his quarters.

The generals that are most in favour with him are Ziethen, Seidlitz, Fouquet, I mean of those who were of the corps which His Majesty had with him in Moravia. Prince Maurice of Dessau[1] is an extraordinary figure, and his character as extraordinary. Everybody knows that his father gave him no education, but left that care to nature, so that he has but just learnt to write his name. He passes, however, for a very good officer and is very active, but I think a little too restless. The King shews him great regard, not only for his military talents, but because he does not choose he should quit his service, which he had once an inclination to do,

[1] Younger son of the "Old Dessauer," b. 1712. See below.

when the King's affairs went ill and the Aulic Council thundered their Proscriptions about the Empire. Marshal Keith[1] is a sensible, amiable man and much respected by the King, more so than I imagined from what I had heard. His Majesty always speaks to him and of him with great regard, and consults him almost more than any of his officers. He labours under some disadvantages, however, as a foreigner and not speaking German familiarly. He has taken care to keep clear of all cabals, both at court and in the army, and by that conduct he has made himself well-beloved and respected by the troops.

General Seidlitz[2] is a young man, a little turned of thirty, but by his merit has been pushed over the heads of great numbers. He is an enemy to the King's system of forming his cavalry without intervals, and in all his manoeuvres before the enemy follows the ordinary method. The King, as he told me, never reproves him, but has never revoked the rule he had once laid down to be observed upon that head. The King has a great affection for him, and as he was out of order with his wound, which he got at Rosbach, His Majesty went every other day to see him and spent an hour or two with him alone. He speaks his mind freely and as an honest man, and has more reading and knowledge than most of them I met with.

General Ziethen[3] is an old officer, of great merits and of an exemplary life. He has something in his countenance that bespeaks your favour, and does his business with the greatest coolness and steadiness. All the army agrees that nobody is so quick in judging of the force or weakness of the enemy's disposition, nor so lively in the execution. The troops follow him with pleasure, and the King shews him the highest esteem. He says that Ziethen is only good in the field and before an enemy; for that at a review or sham fight he makes blunder upon blunder, which made him once have a middling opinion of him; but that he has found since that playing at soldiers was tiresome to him, and that he owes him a great deal.

General Fouquet[4] is a personal friend of the King's, who has made him Governor of Glatz and its county, which is in such order as to excite the admiration of everybody. He has a lively eye and is quick at repartee, severe in his discipline, which he learnt under the old Prince of Anhalt[5], to whom he was aide-de-camp, and

[1] Hon. James Edward Keith (1698–1758), brother of George, 10th Earl Marischal, with whom he had taken part in the rebellion of 1715; served successively, and greatly distinguished himself in the armies of Spain, Russia and Sweden; in 1747 joined that of Frederick, who greatly valued his military ability and made him Field-Marshal; killed at Hochkirch this year.

[2] Friedrich Wilhelm v. Seydlitz (1721–73), the celebrated Prussian general of cavalry.

[3] Hans Joachim v. Zieten (1699–1786), general of cavalry; famous for his fire and activity and his brilliant services, notably at Liegnitz.

[4] Heinrich Aug. Baron de la Mothe Fouquet (1689–1774), general of infantry.

[5] Leopold, prince of Anhalt-Dessau (1676–1747); known as *Der alte Dessauer*, one of the greatest soldiers of the Prussian army; distinguished himself at Blenheim and in the

preserves the old Prussian dress of that time. The officers stand in great awe of him, but universally allow his merit. It was he, who conducted the heavy artillery and its train down to Olmütz, and his orders and regulations were a lesson for all officers; as of all parts of the military service, that of escorting envoys is the least brilliant but the most difficult and hazardous. The precision and order with which his convoy was conducted was admirable, so that he arrived in the plain of Olmütz without any accident, and without an interval between his divisions.

I must not omit to mention among the Prussian generals the young Prince of Wirtemberg[1], who has married the King's niece, upon condition the children should be Protestants, and to whom the States of Wirtemberg give annual pension upon the same condition. He is a lieutenant-general of horse and the King commonly gives him the command of a separate corps, in which he always distinguishes himself. He is brave, humane, alert and vigilant in procuring intelligence; is much beloved and if he lives will make a great officer.

I don't mention several other officers who might deserve to be put in this list, because their names are unknown to your Lordship. I shall only add that the King has thirty aides-de-camp, and that it is at present a standing order that nobody is to give credit to any commands brought in the King's name in time of action, unless by one of them; and they have a particular uniform to distinguish them. Among this number, the King picks out such as he thinks proper for different services as quarter-master general, captain of the Guides etc. and they have as *aides* to them the Chasseurs on horseback, who do excellent service and are all above the common rank of soldiers. Their reward is a fixed one of the employments in the forests and chaces belonging to the Crown.

General Retzow[2] is commissary general for the army, but serves with the army in a day of battle and is much esteemed. The Margrave Charles[3] is a good-natured man and well-esteemed, but not as an officer of any superior genius, no more than Prince Ferdinand, the King's youngest brother, who is otherwise well-liked in the army for his civility, and by the soldiers for his personal courage.

In this account of the Prussian army your Lordship will find a great many things which I represent as having pleased me, and so they certainly did. It is just after that to say what I did not like, and upon this head I shall be very short. The service is

campaign against Charles XII and afterwards at Mollwitz; gained battle of Kesseldorf 1745; creator of the Prussian infantry.

[1] Friedrich (1732–97), brother of Louis, the reigning Duke, whom he succeeded 1795, general in the Prussian army.

[2] Friedrich August v. Retzow, lieutenant-general (1699–1758), one of Frederick' most brilliant generals; incurred, however, his displeasure at Hochkirch and died this year, Nov. 5.

[3] The Margrave Karl Friedrich Albrecht, of Brandenburg-Schwedt (1705–62).

certainly done with exactness, but with less life and gaiety than anywhere I have yet seen. A pensive attention to their duty is the prevailing turn, and I never saw an army where the officers were so little communicative, or where it was so difficult to get any information. One is obliged to proceed with great caution in asking questions, and without some art one runs a risk of getting no answers, so that it is disagreeable to be a stranger among them. I attribute this to their living constantly with their corps and having no intercourse with anybody out of it, which makes them suspicious of being overreached in conversation, and drawn to say something they should not say.

When an officer has once committed a fault, which falls within the King's knowledge, he must not expect to get over it. The Prince of Bevern is in this case, but he had his enemies as well as friends, the common lot of all men[1]. What has ruined him with the King is the idea, which has been given to His Majesty, that that Prince out of despair gave up everything and was taken prisoner by design, by which he left the army many hours without a leader. This is pretended to be proved by the disposition he made of his papers before he went out, under pretence of reconnoitring, which denoted a design of not coming back. His friends justify him and say he often went out in the same way, so that it is impossible to know the truth. It is certain that he made a noble resistance against the whole Austrian army, with only 18,000 men, in a situation that required double the number, and that he was very near winning the day. The other accused generals have likewise their friends, but nobody chooses to be very free upon any of these topics and when they have told you anything, they exact a promise of secrecy from you, for fear it should come to the King's ears.

In short, my Lord, the machine is created, subsists and is put in motion solely by the genius of the Prince that presides over it. Heaven will, I hope, preserve his life; for it strikes me as of much greater consequence, since I have seen him than before. What general would have ventured to have proposed the things he did the last campaign? Or what council of war would have come in to them? The battle of Rosbach is his own, and the battle of Lissa[2] still more so; for when several of the officers represented to His Majesty, that the Austrians, if he was beat, might cut them off from Great Glogau and consequently throw him into Upper Silesia, he said that he was fighting for his all, and that those who made representations were *des faquins*. Breslau he besieged with only 10,000 men in the middle of winter, where he told me that he had been obliged *de payer d'effronterie*, but he owned he was frighten'd when they brought him the list of the garrison after the capitulation was signed. After six weeks winter-quarters, he

[1] August Wilhelm, Duke of Brunswick-Bevern; had distinguished himself as general in the Prussian army, but was defeated at Breslau, Nov. 1757, and was taken prisoner after the battle; afterwards governor of Stettin.

[2] *I.e.* Leuthen.

opened the campaign with the siege of Schweidnitz, and had collected a formidable new army and armed them with the Austrian firelocks, whilst everybody thought he could not get half the recruits he wanted. He marched after that into Moravia when his horse and dragoons had not yet received their tents, so that till a little before I left them, they had only had straw ones. He is now, as all the world knows, in Bohemia, where I doubt not but he will give the Austrians employment enough to prevent their penetrating into his dominions....

The town of Berlin is the most magnificent I ever saw, as well for the breadth of the streets, their cutting each other at right angles, as for the magnificence of the buildings. This King has as much taste for building as his father, and if he lives and enjoys a long peace, he will still embellish it considerably; the opera house, the Roman Catholic church, the Invalids, and the Palace he has built for his brother Prince Henry, are real monuments of his magnificence. The number of inhabitants is not in proportion to the size of the town, but I can't say I found it so thin of people as it had been represented to me; for it had the same look that all cities have in the summer time, when numbers are in the country. A great many considerable manufactures flourish there, and all the rich stuffs and *galanteries* worn at Court and in the country are the produce of them. The Court is very polite and magnificent, and in no place a stranger is so much caressed and taken notice of as there. The Queen is a well-bred, amiable Princess, and what does her the highest honour, but is at the same time very extraordinary in one of that sex of whatever rank she be, is the affectionate regard she always expressed for the King, of which I had many proofs during the few days I had the honour to pay my court to Her Majesty, upon my going to and coming from the army[1]. The two young Princesses, wives to the King's brothers, Henry and Ferdinand, are very handsome and polite, especially the former, who is a Princess of Cassel[2]. They live very magnificently, and all strangers are constantly invited to their Courts, so that they are never at a loss where to find amusement. At present there is no public diversion at Berlin, as the neighbourhood of the armies keeps them always alert, and the adventure of the Austrian General Haddick is still fresh in their memories[3].

The King is very much beloved by his subjects as well as admired, and the facility they have of addressing themselves to him not a little contributes to it. The country is not overpeopled, and if the war lasts any time, that will be sensibly felt. It was easy to perceive a scarcity of men, as I travelled thro' it; but they are ready to the last man, to march under the banner of their

[1] Elizabeth, da. of Ferdinand Albert, duke of Brunswick.

[2] Above.

[3] Andreas, Count Hadik v. Futak, Austrian general of cavalry and field-marshal (1710–90); succeeded with a force of Croats, in October 1757, in raiding Berlin and exacting a ransom of £30,000.

master. The Prince of Prussia was much beloved; but his not being permitted to make the campaign this year made his loss less regretted, as the people had taken it into their heads he must be a bad soldier, because the King had left him at home; this increased his infirmities and probably hastened his end. The Princess of Prussia I did but just see, no more than the King's sister Princess Amelia. The two young Princes are bred up without any state or ceremony, so that when they are in the apartments they are no more attended to than private people. They are both very promising, but the youngest has the most vivacity.

I say nothing about the ministers as they are well known and have but little to say, the King informing them very seldom of his schemes, so that they are at a loss what to say. The great dread of the country is of the Russians and that absorbs all other fear[s], and indeed, their barbarous conduct, where they pass, authorises them, and the ignorance of the King's plan for opposing them increases the apprehensions conceived of them.

I took Potzdam on my way to Hanover, having a great curiosity to see the place where the King of Prussia spent his hours of peace; and I am very glad I did, because it is very well worth seeing. It is a pretty large town, increasing every day by the additions the King is making to it. It is his abode and that of a certain number of regiments, with some manufactures. The Palace was begun by the last King and completed by this. What struck me the most was the elegance and magnificence of the furniture as well as the singularity. All glaring colours are banished thence and none but the most delicate ones substituted in their stead, such as pale greens, blues, flesh-colour, purples, embroidered and laced in the most sumptuous and costly manner, the ceilings and carving suited to them; everything that can delight or engage the most voluptuous eye is employed with profusion, so that I could not help asking myself every minute whether the same man I had left with barely common necessaries could be the author of so much voluptuousness, and surpass others as much in this taste and delicacy as in the rougher feats of war; the contrast is indeed a singular one.

Sans Souci is in the same taste, and the gardens very pretty. His Majesty is a great lover of fruit and is very curious in it. He has a great quantity here, and takes a pleasure in trying experiments in gardening when he has leisure for such amusements. I shall be very happy if this letter can add to your Lordship's...

Your Lordship's most obliged and most dutiful son,

JOSEPH YORKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 197, f. 372.] WIMPOLE, *August 16th*, 1758.

[Discusses the military situation, considers the Dutch hopeless, and that Joe can do nothing, and thinks the army of Prince Ferdinand ought to be strengthened as much as possible, due care being taken to keep a sufficient number of troops at home to resist invasion. He is decidedly of opinion against sending the reinforcements, desired by Pitt, to Cherbourg, at least till the situation there was known; possibly the expedition may have been driven away from the place already; nor is it likely that they would make any effectual diversion.]

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 197, f. 394.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *August 17th*, 1758.

...The King is most highly delighted with your long letter to your Father, has made himself thorough master of every part of it; and I verily believe it has set His Prussian Majesty higher with the King, and has made his alliance more agreeable to His Majesty than anything ever had done before. His Majesty bids me tell you he likes all your letters extremely; but you write with *white ink* and he can't read them; and I know by experience that it is a great disadvantage to performances not to have them easily read...

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 199, f. 259; H. 70, f. 34.] KENSINGTON, *October 5th*, 1758.

MY DEAR LORD,...

I never found His Majesty in such ill humour as he was this day; hardly civil, and that is what I can scarce say has happened, especially of late. He began by telling me—that the French had ruined his country before they left it, that he was ruined for us, who had used him very ill; that at the end of the war he, who was a *great Elector*, should now be only *a little Prince*; that in short, "My Lord you won't give me money, and therefore you must increase my dominions by acquisitions from my enemies." —I told His Majesty that that must depend upon the success of the war. He ran on so that there was no making a reply with decency. When I endeavoured to state the good side of our question from the advices of yesterday, he would not enter into it. What should he do when the enemy should become superior?— and with very hard expressions against Prince Ferdinand, who (he said) was (or might be) a good general, but that he ruined him,

spurred other people's horses and, what was worse, that he was not his servant but another Prince's. [The King, however, totally disclaimed any separate negotiation now with the French] and to confirm what the King had said, His Majesty was pleased to add —that if he had known what has since happened (or how ill he should be used), he might have taken other measures at first, but now he could not; he was tied to us and there he must remain— When I endeavoured to say anything by way of alleviation, or to represent our affairs, and particularly the receipts of the customs this year, better than was to be expected, his answer always was— "What good will that do me? That won't pay my losses nor those of my subjects."...

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 200, f. 340.] POWIS HOUSE, Wed. morning, *Nov. 15th*, 1758.

...Your Grace [says] a great deal too much on the part I took last night. I thought it my duty to take some pains upon the subject[1] for the sake of the King's service, though I see the intricacy and difficulty of it, and therefore had no scruple (as you know) to communicate my ideas beforehand. But in my situation I am really ashamed to appear so forward; but I feared we should spend all our time in vague conversation without coming to any point, as your Grace saw my next neighbour was going on, though I liked his disposition....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 9, f. 302.] HAGUE, *December 1st*, 1758.

MY LORD,...

I would not let the post go out without...expressing the highest sense of the obligations I think myself under to your Lordship for the great and able part you have been so good as to take in this arduous negotiation, in which I am involved. The Princess Royal is not less sensible than I am of this truth and told me to-day that she would never forgive me if I neglected to let you know how much she thinks herself, her family and the Republic your debtors for the pains you have taken to bring the affair to a point and to analyse the whole in so methodical and masterly a manner, and that she should never forget the particular friendship you have shew'd to her upon this important occasion....[2]

[1] Probably the affairs of Holland.

[2] See vol. ii. 312, and above, p. 136.

H.R.H. Princess Royal, Regent of the Netherlands, to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[R. O., S. P. Holland.] *5th December*, 1758.

As nothing ever gave me more pleasure than the letter the King had the goodness to write me[1], so I must own nothing ever hurt me more than the papers you received from the office[2], as I find them alone proper to create disputes instead of softening animosities; you know as well as me, my good Yorke, what unreasonable people we have to do with, and that next week all our enemies will be in array expecting to take fire, if there is not some hope of redress offered. I own I see nothing hitherto that can serve to that purpose, and therefore must beg of you to represent in the strongest manner possible to the King and the most intimate of his Council, that not only my authority, but the good old Protestant Cause and *the Union of the Puissances Maritimes*, will be quite forgot, and that I shall think myself very miserable to be an eyewitness to so much bad, without being able to prevent it; be so good then to try to have some more favourable orders, and let us not come forth, without at least curing some sores and making the most honest of our traders help us against the others. My heart is so full that I could not help writing you my mind, and I hope you will forgive me, being always your sincere Friend,

ANNE.

[Writing on December 15th, 1758, General Yorke announces the approaching death of the Princess, on whose mind the threatened breach between Holland and England was preying. She died January 12th, 1759.]

Col. Robert Clive to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 247, f. 320.]

CALCUTTA, *Dec. 30th*, 1758. Rec. at Wimpole *Oct. 7th*, 1759.

MY LORD,

Words cannot do justice to my sentiments or express what I think of the honour done me by your favour of the 11th November 1757. If there be any merit due to the success of our arms, it is more than rewarded with your Lordship's approbation; accept in return, my Lord, all that the most gratified heart can offer.

As it may be of some amusement to your Lordship, in your leisure hours, to learn the particulars of the late extraordinary

[1] Assuring her of support.

[2] Of November 28, which insisted on the execution of the treaties of 1678 and 1674 and on the cessation of the carrying trade to the French West Indies, as well as that of the contraband trade in naval stores, and also affirmed the right of search.

revolution[1], give me leave to recommend to your Lordship the bearer, Mr Walsh[2]; from him you will have a circumstantial account of an event fraught with many advantages to both public and private, an event which may hereafter be made subservient to very great purposes.

Notwithstanding the arrival of Mr Lally[3] with a very considerable body of land forces, and the reduction of Fort St David, we entertain great hopes that in all next year, we shall be superior to our enemies the French in every part of India.

I am with the greatest deference and respect, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most devoted Servant,

ROBERT CLIVE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 209, f. 67.] WREST, *Aug. 9th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

Tho' I troubled your Grace so lately by Mann, I cannot restrain myself from sending this by the post most joyfully to congratulate you on the great success with which it has pleased God to bless His Majesty's arms under Prince Ferdinand[4]....And the meritorious part which you have had in supporting and supplying that army makes me take the more particular pleasure in the event. My Lord Holderness's messenger arrived yesterday within less than an hour after your's set off, and brought me the greatest cordial I have had since my illness.

Between 9 and 10 at night I had another express from my Lord Anson with the occasion of which I am so flattered, that I cannot help relating it. His Majesty said to him,—"I know nobody will take a greater share in the joy and satisfaction which I feel upon the news of this victory than my Lord Hardwicke, and I will have you tell him so by an express." I own I never took anything more kindly of the King in my life—that...he...should have the goodness to think of his old servant, and to do me so gracious a piece of justice....His Majesty told Lord Anson that he had had

[1] p. 170 *n.*

[2] John Walsh (*c.* 1725–95), secretary to Clive; despatched by him to England to lay his plans before the ministers; afterwards M.P. for Worcester, F.R.S. and F.S.A.

[3] Thomas Arthur, Comte de Lally (1702–66), of Irish Jacobite family, had distinguished himself at Fontenoy and accompanied the Young Pretender in 1745 to Scotland. He was given command of the French expedition to India, and had captured the fort on June 1, 1758. His subsequent career, however, was unsuccessful; capitulated and taken prisoner in Pondicherry 1761, and finally executed by the French Government.

[4] At Minden, August 1.

the whole plan of Prince Ferdinand's operations some days, and knew the day this battle would be fought, if the motion Prince Ferdinand intended to make happened to change M. Contade's position, which he expected it would, and so it proved; but he said he had mentioned this to none of his servants[1].

...Surely some immediate consideration should be had about recruiting the British corps in Germany, which probably must have suffered....Pray let the Garter be forthwith sent to Prince Ferdinand. ...Adieu, my dearest Lord, till we meet on Tuesday night, and believe me ever most faithfully, tho' hardly ever before so happily,

Yours,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Solicitor-General

[H. 4, f. 109.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *August 16th*, 1759.

...The King, who is at present the happiest man you ever saw, told me yesterday that he saw the hand of God in this event. That when he looked back to the situation of things on that side, as they stood before, it looked like a miracle. That it put him in mind of what is said in the Old Testament, that God Almighty sent out a destroying Angel etc., and what had happened to the French army looked like something of that kind. That the French owned they had lost 10,000 men. I took the liberty to ask His Majesty what he took the numbers on each side to be before the engagement; to which the King answered, Marshal Contade's near 60,000 and Prince Ferdinand about 35,000, after the corps he had sent off with the Hereditary Prince, and his other necessary detachments. How shameful for the French!

The King was much the happier yesterday morning by having just received a messenger, with letters from Prince Ferdinand, containing an account of the French retreat, which they do *à toutes jambes*. Prince Ferdinand, in the pursuit, was got as far as Paderborn, and the Hereditary Prince was just at the heels of the French, with 15,000 men continually harrassing them, making prisoners, taking cannon and baggage and receiving their deserters, which are very numerous. Col. Luckner took Contade's coach (like Cope's) with his strong box of papers; and what particularly

[1] "The King...on receiving General Yorke's courier, owned that he had had Prince Ferdinand's plans in his pocket for 10 days, without communicating it to a single person." Walpole's *George II*, iii. 190.

delighted His Majesty, was that these papers had been just brought to him by the same messenger....

This affair of Lord George Sackville, of which I did not hear one word till I came to town, makes a prodigious noise and racquet here. The Duke of Richmond gave me a full account of it yesterday at Kensington[1], and this morning Capt. Smith, Lord George's aide-de-camp. It is so long a story, and turns upon such minute circumstances, that it is impossible to bring it within the compass of a letter. The principal point seems to turn upon this—Lord George was at the head of the cavalry of the right wing; Prince Ferdinand sent orders to him by his two aides-de-camp, Col. Fitzroy[2] and Capt. Ligonier, who (as is usual) took different routes. Capt. Ligonier came up first and told Lord George that the Prince ordered him to advance the cavalry to sustain the British infantry, who were engaged with the French horse. In a very few minutes Col. Fitzroy arrived and repeated the orders to be—to advance the British cavalry to sustain the British infantry. Lord George observed upon the difference between the orders:—What could he do? where was the Prince? then rid up to him a quarter or half a mile for an explanation. Then came back, and ordered the cavalry to advance; and (as the Duke of Richmond said) reproved them more than once for marching too fast, for that they would get into disorder. Capt. Smith says that the loss of time was in the whole but a few minutes; but the event was that the cavalry of the right wing did not act that day; for the British foot had put the French horse to flight, tho' they could not pursue them....

Lord George Sackville to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[H. 9, f. 376.] Copy. ROTTERDAM, *September 2nd*, 1759.

DEAR SIR,

I cannot leave this country without returning you thanks for the many marks of the regard and friendship which you have shown me upon every occasion. I avoided passing thro' the Hague upon my return home. Had I seen you, I must have troubled you with a long and disagreeable detail of the reasons which made me ask for my recall, and as I must have enter'd into circumstances in which Prince Ferdinand's name would have been brought in question, I thought it would have been a very unpleasing subject to you, and that it was better upon all accounts, you

[1] Charles Lennox, 3rd Duke of Richmond (1735–1806); had brought the news of the victory, with Charles Fitzroy, from the battlefield.

[2] Charles Fitzroy, Lieutenant-Colonel (1737–97); later 1st Baron Southampton.

should hear from England whatever was proper for me to say upon that subject.

No military man can have a right to complain of being found fault with or censured by name, if he in any shape neglects his duty, after he is fairly accused and has had an opportunity of attempting to justify himself; but I cannot yet comprehend why Prince Ferdinand should proceed in so unusual a manner with me. If I had done wrong, why was I to be censured by his complimenting another, and why was that common justice denied me of knowing my crime, my accuser, or of being heard before I was condemned?

I only mention what relates to the manner; the facts themselves I shall defer saying anything upon till the proper time comes. I shall then justify myself as well as I am able, and shall keep myself as far as possible from saying or doing anything disrespectful to a person so high in the opinion of the world. Whatever is necessary in my own defence must be produced, and truth, I hope, will prevail, tho' I am but too sensible of the many difficulties I must meet with and the prejudices I have to struggle against; but a good conscience is the greatest comfort and support under such circumstances. I beg the favour of you to return no answer to this letter; I only write it to assure you that my not waiting upon you personally was the strongest mark of my attention to you[1].

I am, dear Sir, with great sincerity, [etc.],

GEO. SACKVILLE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 210, f. 115.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, Sunday, *Sept. 2nd*, 1759.

[After discussing various points raised in the Duke's letters, he comes to the question of Spanish mediation between England and France.] Mr Pitt told me on Wednesday that Prince St Severino had returned to the charge since the death of King Ferdinand, and he had answered him with great civility and many professions *dilatorié*, and particularly that the King could not accept of any mediator but for his allies as well as himself, and therefore could say nothing without the consent of his great ally the King of Prussia. He mentioned one remarkable circumstance—that he (Mr Pitt) said to Prince St Severino[2], in one period of the conversation, "Sir, you talk to me as if you thought I had *plus*

[1] Gen. Yorke thought it advisable to take Lord G. Sackville at his word, and sent no reply to this letter (f. 374).

[2] Prince of San Severino, hitherto Neapolitan envoy in London, and now, since the accession of Charles III, representative of Spain.

d'éloignement as to peace than some other of the King's servants may have. But I assure you that I had much rather that the King my Master should enter into a negotiation of peace, whilst he is able to carry on the war, than stay till His Majesty is unable to carry it on, as I can assure you France already is."—He added with some pleasantry, "I thought I would brag a little." I encouraged him in the substance of this idea and said, "I feared the time was very near when the King would become unable to carry on the war." He lays great weight on hearing first from North America. He was in very good humour, and this was all that was material in his conversation.

...I hope to be at Wimpole tomorrow night, and indeed, I never wanted air and exercise more than I do at present. I shall not fail to give the best answers I can to such letters as your Grace shall honour me with; but I beg you will have the goodness to spare me, as to long letters, as much as you can, for indeed I am almost worn out; and I do not wonder to hear your Grace sometimes complain so too. Don't be angry with me for this; for indeed nobody can be more cordially devoted to your service, nor more desirous to render you the best according to his possibilities....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to Lady Anson

[H. 41, f. 163.] HAGUE, *September 14th*, 1759.

...Whilst I am writing, the amiable mail of the 7th is arrived from England, and brings one the glad tidings and much comfort from my honest, gallant friend Amherst. I can't express to you the satisfaction I feel at his deserved success, both for the public and himself....Everybody in the army will be pleased to see Lord Granby get forward; for he is a man of strict honour, and desires to listen to those who have the service the most at heart. I think Wolfe seems to have acted with his usual fire in landing near Quebec, and I hope Amherst will be able to get forward so as to second him, tho' he is too ambitious not to do *the impossible* to succeed, without my friend's help. I have two short letters from my friend Col. Eyre; one from Ticonderoga, the other from Crown Point, and I can't help being pleased with the use Amherst makes of him and the difference of the style of his letters this year and the former ones. He tells me that they are making all diligence to get forward to St John's, so that I hope they will be up in time to co-operate with Wolfe, for that job, I suppose, is the most difficult of any....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 17, f. 62.] HAGUE, *September 25th*, 1759.

...We wait with impatience for further news from Quebec. Had Amherst the means of conveying news to Wolfe, I should be in no pain about the affair; but as I am ignorant of the possibility of that being done in time, I can't help having some uneasy moments. I hope, however, you do me justice when you reflect upon the conduct of those I have answered for, and that my worthy friend Amherst stands high in your good graces. There does not exist a worthier nor a more modest man than that, nor a plainer and better soldier. Wolfe has more fire and is very enterprizing; and if he had an opportunity under such a general as Prince Ferdinand, would go as far as any officer in Europe....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 212, f. 87; H. 71, f. 6.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 15th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I send your Lordship the accounts I received from the Admiralty of the state of our affairs at Quebec. General Wolfe's letter will be printed, leaving out some or all the paragraphs which I have just got time, by stealth, to have transcribed for your information[1]. The King, encouraged, as he says, by my Lord Anson, was very sanguine this morning that Quebec would still be taken, and I heard George Grenville has talked in the same way. Lord Anson had not seen Wolfe's letter—if he had, I am sure it would have been impossible for him to have been of that opinion. Mr Pitt with reason gives it all over, and declares so publicly. I think I see he is not quite satisfied with Wolfe in his heart for the paragraphs which will be omitted in the paper to be published....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 212, f. 138.] WIMPOLE, Wednesday night, *Oct. 16th*, 1759.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I was never more surprised in my life than after reading your Grace's letter and poring over the extraordinary Gazette from beginning to end, and finding some black atoms arise as to the event, to open a letter from my daughter Anson,

[1] Wolfe had written to Pitt on Sept. 9 in the most despairing tone, concluding, "My constitution is entirely ruined, without the consolation of having done any considerable service to the state, or without any prospect of it" (*Chatham Corres.* i. 425). This consolation, however, it is known that he received in the moment of victory, immediately before death.

dated from the Admiralty at half an hour past ten at night, and read that Quebec was taken on the 18th of September, and that this came by an express arrived that instant in 25 days from that place....I do most sincerely rejoice with your Grace upon this glorious success, and beg you will lay me at His Majesty's feet with my most dutiful and joyful congratulations on this happy occasion....I question whether any other two officers, except Saunders and Wolfe, would have carried this arduous affair through; and I think I never read in my whole life, two more able and better writ letters from military officers than those printed in the extraordinary Gazette....In the midst of my joy, I am filled with grief for the death of General Wolfe, which I look upon as a very great public loss. I am sincerely of opinion that some public mark of honour and respect should be paid to his memory, tho' he is removed from being sensible of it; suppose a monument in Westminster Abbey at the public expense[1], or if anything more significant and honourable can be thought of; and that some signal reward should be conferred on Admiral Saunders. I long to see the detailed account....

But I rejoice in nothing so much as in the appearances towards peace....I do not like Denmark for a mediator more than Mr Pitt. I look upon them as a false, knavish Court, sold to France....But the great point is for the English ministers to settle their own ideas and opinions what they will do—what they will give up, and what insist to retain. Mon. Knyphausen's conversation gave me great consolation by finding Mr Pitt talk so reasonably upon that head. The nonsense of the populace and of the printed papers about holding and keeping everything and reducing France to nothing, should be battered down and discountenanced. I don't mean that you should talk of what you will really do; but those false and ill-meant suggestions, spread amongst the people, should be discouraged to the last degree. What did we get after all the Duke of Marlborough's amazing successes by rejecting the terms offered at the Treaty of Gertruydenberg and the Hague? We lost all the fruit of those successes. If you keep Quebec, you must keep all Canada and Louisburg as the key to it, and is that possible without fighting on for ever?...

[1] On October 22, 1759, the D. of N. writes that he has communicated this proposal to the King and Pitt, both of whom liked it extremely. (N. 212, f. 285.)

Earl of Hardwicke to the Right Hon. William Pitt

[H. 75, f. 192; *Chatham Corr.* i. 443.] WIMPOLE, *Oct. 18th*, 1759.

DEAR SIR,

With the greatest pleasure I lay hold of this first opportunity to thank you for the honour of your very obliging note, which I received by yesterday's post. As a dutiful subject to the King, a lover of my country and a sincere friend to this administration, I do, upon the happy event of the conquest of Quebec, most cordially congratulate you in a particular manner. This important and, at the instant it came, unexpected success has crowned this campaign on the part of England in the most glorious manner. God grant that it may lead to what we all wish, an honourable and lasting peace. The King has now great materials in his hands for the good work, and I make no doubt but His Majesty and his ministers will make the wisest and most advantageous use of them.

I have nothing to add but my best wishes for your health, and the sincerest assurances of that respect and esteem with which I am,

Dear Sir,

Your most obedient and most humble Servant,

HARDWICKE.

Lord Royston who is now with me, desires me to make you his best compliments of congratulation on this joyful occasion.

Right Hon. William Pitt to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 75, f. 193.] HAYES, *Oct. 20th*, 1759.

MY LORD,

I am too sensible to the honour of your Lordship's very obliging attention, in answer to the short bulletin from my office, to defer expressing my best thanks for such a favour. The defeat of the French army and the reduction of Quebec are, indeed, matters for the warmest congratulations between all faithful servants of the King and lovers of their country. In the many and remote prosperities, which have been given to His Majesty's arms, the hand of Providence is visible, and I devoutly wish that the hand of human wisdom and of sound policy may be conspicuous in the great work of negotiation, whenever this complicated and extensive war is to be wound up in an honourable and advantageous peace. Perhaps it is not too much to say that sustaining this

war, arduous as it has been and still is, may not be more difficult than properly and happily closing it. The materials in His Majesty's hands are certainly very many and great, and it is to be hoped that in working them up in the great edifice of a solid and general pacification of Europe, there may be no confusion of languages, but that the workmen may understand one another. Accept my sincere wishes for your Lordship's health and the assurances of the perfect respect and esteem, with which I have the honour to remain,

Your Lordship's most obedient and most humble Servant,

W. PITT.

May I here beg to present my best compliments to Lord Royston, if with your Lordship.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 212, f. 350.] WIMPOLE, *Oct. 24th*, 1759.

...What has been flung out by His Catholic Majesty's ministers relating to *the équilibre in America* appears to me to be very serious and interesting. The term is certainly of new coinage; but I stated that very thing to Mr Pitt in the long conversation, which I had with him last time I was at Kensington....On the subject of the Spanish mediation, I told him I feared that Spain would be jealous of our retaining very considerable acquisitions in America, which might make that Crown the less impartial mediator....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 212, f. 512; H. 71, f. 40.] CLAREMONT, *October 31st*, 1759.

...[Pitt agreed in hoping that peace might be made now, and that another campaign might be avoided.] The great point with him was that he feared the King would insist at a peace upon *dédommagement* [for Hanover], and he insisted that that should be cleared up, and that I should tell the King that in no situation could he, or would he, consent to it. He thought it destruction both to the King as King and as Elector; that he knew very well he was thought to be governed by popularity; that he knew where to stop; that to a degree, it was true, but only to a degree; that he hazarded, he might lose his popularity to a degree by the immense sums given for the support of the war upon the continent and the King's Hanover dominions; that he thought it right, and so far he risked his popularity, but then he had the comfort to think that people would see that that was done for the sake of the whole, and not to aggrandise or promote any acquisition for

Hanover; that there he stood, and so far he would maintain his popularity....I mentioned to your Lordship that Mr Pitt had much ridiculed the King's way of talking about the conditions of peace and the retaining "all our conquests." He seemed really desirous of peace this winter and upon reasonable terms; saw the difficulties of carrying on the war in Germany for want of men; was desirous to keep Senegal and Goree, seemed more indifferent about Guadaloupe, supposed we must have Minorca again, and by his manner of discourse I should think keeping possession of Niagara, the Lakes, Crown Point, and a proper security for our own colonies, the Bay of Fundy etc: was all that he had at present determined; that as to [the] rest, Quebec, Montreal and even Louisburg, they were points to be treated upon—not to be given up for nothing, but what might deserve consideration and be proper matter of negotiation....[The Duke had urged on the King the advantage of now making peace[1], to which the King agreed but asked, "What will you do for me?", and complained of his great losses, to which the Duke had replied honestly and straight that he could not give him any hopes.]...

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 216, f. 280.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *January 15th*, 1760.

MY DEAR LORD,...

My long conversation with Mr Pitt arose from himself. He began it at Savile House on Thursday morning where we were interrupted; and I told him I would wait on him to finish it whenever he pleased. He insisted to come to me that evening, which he did between seven and eight and stayed till ten. It was as confidential and friendly as possible, and I should have writ your Grace an account of it, if what he flung out had not been in substance the same with what I have heard your Grace say very lately had passed between you two, at different times. The points I chiefly pressed were the not neglecting these tentatives from France, relating to a separate negotiation with that Power, and the strengthening Prince Ferdinand's army to the utmost degree possible, even by some more troops from hence. I endeavoured to shew him that, if France thought fit to treat without her allies, that was nothing to us, provided the King took his allies along with him; that in the course of such a separate negotiation it would probably appear impracticable to finish a treaty without comprehending the affairs of Germany, and this might oblige France to

[1] A blank page intervenes here on which the Duke has written, "a mistake, of which I believe you are glad." The letter consists of 13 folios.

induce her allies or some of them to come in, provided that the Crown was under such a necessity for peace as we had been informed. This he at last allowed, and told me in what way he wished Joe might be writ to[1]....He talked very friendly and with great satisfaction of your Grace....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 17, f. 109.] HAGUE, *March 25th*, 1760.

DEAR BROTHER,

[Replies to his brother's complaint of sending no news.] The truth is I have not always time to write for the secure conveyance, and thro' the office everything would not be proper, because it is impossible for me not to mention the method in which business is conducted there and the particular reserve that is observed towards me from that quarter, at a time when either great confidence should be shewn, or some other person employed for the great affair of bringing on a negotiation. It is plain my principal has no desire it should pass through my hands, and yet fate throws it in my way; but I am sorry those who like to have me be the cat's paw don't exert a little more, for as things are at present managed, we shall never get forward.

You know that I had pressing orders to speak to Mr D'Affry and they were repeated several times, till I found an opportunity of executing them, which I did in the way I thought the most likely to obtain our wish, and therefore avoided saying flatly that France should *abandon* her allies, thinking it more decent at setting out to make that come in by way of *innuendo*. This has, however, been called in a certain quarter changing my orders according to my fancy, and looked upon as a sort of crime, tho' the approbation of others has prevented that from being reproached to me....I have had two answers from France. In the first I was told the negotiation had been put into the hands of Spain, but nevertheless, provided we would allow the communicating to Spain, they were ready to treat in any other manner; but as we were the conquerors, we ought to propose terms. In the second, they go a step further, and offer to include lower Saxony in their peace with England, Hanover, Hesse and Brunswick, and will do their best to contribute to help the King of Prussia out of his scrape, but don't well see how they can treat directly with him, as they are not at war with him; or in other words, they don't know how to shake off the Court of Vienna and the Russ without our assistance. A month passes without my being told whether I had done well or ill or without any new instructions, and at last comes a dry commendation with a drier order that, if *chance* threw Mr D'Affry in my way, I should tell him we were always desirous of peace, and it was

[1] He received instructions on Jan. 25 for conducting negotiations (f. 459).

a pity they were not more explicit....Either peace or war should be determined, and at present we don't seem to have determined for either. There can be no doubt but France wishes and wants it, and the Duc de Choiseul alone is against it; but he won't be able to withstand the rest of his colleagues if they find us in earnest.... I repeat it, that there is the most favourable appearance for peace, and France with a little encouragement will quit her allies. She has paid nothing for 10 months to Russia, and all except Choiseul are against Vienna....This is the true picture of my situation, and the only thing worth sending to you from your most obliged and affectionate,

J. Y.

P.S. As I was sealing up my letter, the post of the 21st from England arrived and brought me your letter of that date. I must first beg you would set my silence in a proper light in Grosvenor Square; it has proceeded from my being embarrassed and full of uneasiness, and being unwilling to complain and talk of grievances which it was my business to get through, but which I could not help talking of in a letter to a Father and a Protector....These Prussians in England[1] are the most futile people in the world, for otherwise they would feel and see that I am a better friend to their Master than they have had it ever in their power to be....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 219, f. 278; H. 71, f. 189.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *April 9th*, 1760.

...[Pitt had expressed great indignation at the negotiation with Frederick at the French Court.] I only insisted upon doing what might be most likely to procure a peace; for that we were not able to carry on a war another year upon the present foot, as we should leave a debt upon the nation of four millions for the expenses of this, the current year....Mr Pitt flew into a violent passion at my saying we could not carry on the war another year; that that was the way to make peace impracticable and to encourage our enemy: that we might have difficulties but he knew we could carry on the war, and were one hundred times better able to do it than the French; that *we* did not want a peace, but that, for the sake of the King of Prussia, we were willing to forego the great advantages which we had reason to promise ourselves from this campaign in every part of the world. In short there was no talking to him.... I begin now to think with your Lordship (tho' from all his former conversations I own I was of a contrary opinion) that nothing serious and effectual will be done towards peace, and God knows what the consequence will be. [Mr Pitt also expressed himself opposed to sending reinforcements to Germany.]...

[1] Frederick's two envoys, Knyphausen and Michel.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 219, f. 303.] MOOR PARK, *April 10th*, 1760.

...Your Grace says that you begin to be of my opinion about Mr Pitt's disposition as to peace. I never said that he might not wish it, but I have said, and do think, that he hardly knows how to set about it. He sees that in order to obtain peace, so much of our acquisitions must be given up; and the populace, who have been blown up to such an extravagant degree, and of whom he is unwilling to quit his hold, will be so much disappointed, that he is ready to start at the approaches to it. Under these impressions it is amazing to me that, considering how much depends upon the events of this campaign in Germany, he should not even propose the sending some British infantry to that country. Perhaps he wants to be ravished to it[1]....

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 10, f. 41.] HAGUE, *July 14th*, 1760.

...I told the Duke of Newcastle last post all I knew of that affair, which appears indeed a very bad one....Your Lordship will consider H.S.H. [Prince Ferdinand] too in the light of a man who had been personally ill used by L[ord] G. S[ackville], and his sensibility upon that account might carry him further than he perhaps would have gone in cold blood. L[ord] G[eorge] had crossed him upon every occasion, and had gone so far as publicly to accuse him of an intention to abandon the interests of Hanover and England and to deliver the army up to the King of Prussia. This and many other causes, if they do not justify, at least account for a part of what happened to that Lord, tho' they were never brought up in judgment against him....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 225, f. 168.] WIMPOLE, *August 20th*, 1760.

...

1. As to the great object of peace, it is uppermost in my thoughts, as it is always in my wishes, because I cannot satisfy myself how the war can be supported upon the present foot, going on increasing as it must do; at least without swelling the national debt to such a degree as must produce a national bankruptcy. But notwithstanding this, I own I do not see how it is possible at present to take any actual steps towards it. [Further efforts with

[1] See also f. 454.

D'Affry might have the air of too much courting. The attitude of Spain alarmed him greatly.

2. On the supposition that another year's war could not be avoided, the Duke should draw up a paper exhibiting the state of supplies and the difficulties in raising the necessary sums, to be laid before the King, Pitt and the Chancellor of the Exchequer; this would show how desirable, if not necessary, it was to reduce expenditure immediately. He might also draw up another paper, in which might be laid out any proposed economies in America, the fleet or upon the continent, to be shown to Pitt alone confidentially and with the design to make his measures practicable[1].] As to mortgaging the Sinking Fund, my faithful advice to your Grace is never to give way to it, either in whole or in part. I think it will be destruction. It will be playing away the last stake, and I deprecate its being done while you are at the head of the Treasury. [It might give a handle to the Opposition in the general election.] You did *circumrodere* and nibble too near, in the last instance, by anticipating the income of the Sinking Fund till Michaelmas 1761. You will now probably carry it on till March 1762 or perhaps further, and that is too much.

3. The produce of the Civil List from Midsummer 1759 to Midsummer 1760 is indeed immense, and proves the unreasonableness of that addition which Sir Robert Walpole extorted by colour of an *arrear*, which he called a *deficiency*[2]. Your Grace was certainly in the right in the advice which you hinted to the King as to the saving appearances in the manner of applying it. But to speak seriously upon this subject, as much as I love and revere His Majesty, and as much devoted as I am to his immediate service, one cannot help feeling the unreasonableness of the Civil List's being so vast, at a time when the burdens upon the people are so immense and heavy. Queen Anne gave £100,000 per annum, at one period of time, towards the expenses of the war (tho' I believe not for a very long one). 'Tis great pity but some method could be fallen upon, without hurting the Crown in the consequence, that the public might just now avail itself of this extraordinary and unexpected exceeding. By what the King said to your Grace—"You won't take it from me, will you?"—it is

[1] This work was immediately undertaken by the Duke. Below, p. 249.

[2] Probably the addition to the Civil List made by Walpole to George II on his accession is meant, by means of which chiefly he is said to have maintained himself in power.

plain that he himself feels the weight of this. But I agree this is a point not at present to be talked of to those who come out of the Patriot school. The King must from thence see the greatest reason to applaud the management of his Treasury....

General Amherst to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[H. 17, f. 220.]. Copy. CAMP OF MONTREAL, *September 8th*, 1760.

DEAR YORKE,

I have as much pleasure in telling you Canada belongs to the King as I had in receiving the capitulation of it this day, from the satisfaction I know it will give you. The French troops all lay down their arms, and are not to serve during the war; their behaviour in carrying on a cruel and barbarous war in this country, I thought deserved this disgrace. I have suffered by the *Rapides* not by the enemy. I entered the inhabited country with all the savages and I have not hurt the head of a peasant, his wife or his child, not a house burnt, or a disorder committed; the country people amazed; won't believe what they see; the notions they had of our cruelties from the exercise of their own savages, drove them into the woods; I have fetched them out and put them quiet in their habitations, and they are vastly happy. I can't tell you how much I am obliged to you for your good letter to me; but tho' 'tis three in the morning of the 9th, [and] I have not slept these two nights past, I would not let Major Barré go away with my despatches without telling this news to you. I am with all my heart, dear Yorke,

Most truly yours,

JEFF. AMHERST.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 226, f. 285.] WIMPOLE, *September 14th*, 1760.

[Discusses the state of affairs abroad]; I don't say with our friend, Mr Pitt, that "without a battle I will not be for continuing the measures in Germany" another year. That is not talking like a great minister; for I remember the great Duke D'Alva's maxim, "that it is the business of a general always to get the better of his enemy, but not always to fight; and if he can do his business without fighting, so much the better." Notwithstanding this, I agree that what Mr Pitt says, will be the way of talking of nine parts in ten of the people of England[1]. [He does not wonder that

[1] He wrote also on June 6, 1760 (N. 222, f. 30), "The only question was whether he should immediately fight a battle. Of *that* nobody could judge but the general upon the

Mr Pitt is displeased with the Spanish memorials[1]; fears that their representations concerning the cutting of logwood have foundation, but not those concerning the Newfoundland fisheries; but the whole matter requires diligent search amongst the papers at the Secretary's office, and delay will be of no disadvantage....He cannot take the Duke's hint about coming up to town now, which Mr Pitt desired[2].] I hope you will have the goodness to forgive me, if I tell you my whole mind upon that subject. Your Grace is my witness with what kind of good-will I attend the public business when in town, without having, or wishing to have, any other call to it besides my duty and zeal to the King and my attachment to you; and this, however insignificant, I am willing to do during the time of Parliament and the general course of business in town. But during the no long time that I allow myself to reside here, I must beg leave to excuse myself from such summons's and from taking long journeys, which do not agree with me so well now at seventy as they did when I was younger. I dare say it will not be expected, tho' I did it upon the fatal affair of the Capitulation of Closterseven, and should not decline it upon any such pressing occasion, which, God forbid should ever happen again. I propose to return to Grosvenor Square about the latter end of the next month which is but about 6 weeks hence, which I am very sure is as soon as the answers to these Memorials can, or ought to be, settled[3]....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 227, f. 164; H. 72, f. 62.] CLAREMONT, *September 27th*, 1760.

...He [Pitt] held a pretty extraordinary conversation with me yesterday. He had said before Lord Holderness, etc. that he saw no signs of peace; there would be another campaign. He came afterwards to my lodgings. He began, we must prepare for war; that if peace was to be negotiated in the winter, we ought to be prepared for another campaign, or we should treat to great disadvantage. I agreed with him, and said I was preparing the state of our expenses etc.; he replied,—we must raise sixteen millions, that we could easily do it; that there was such an affluence of money from all parts, East Indies, West Indies, etc., that we might get as many millions as we pleased.—I told him

spot; but whether the general plan of the campaign should be *offensive* or *defensive* is a political consideration and to be determined upon a great variety of circumstances, of many of which the King and his ministers are the most proper judges."

[1] p. 151. [2] N. 226, f. 269; H. 72, f. 18.

[3] Pitt forwarded his despatch to Lord Bristol, to be shown to Wall on September 20. See p. 250.

that was not the point. The question was where to find the fund to be a security for these millions....He then exclaimed against *funding* the Sinking Fund[1] in which I agreed, and wanted plainly to give me directions what to do. I took it up pretty warmly, and asked him why he would not think that *we* were preparing everything to do the best in our power? He answered—"I know *you* are of my mind, but there are little, low genius's (meaning Mr Legge) that think differently."—He went off in good humour. But I see plainly his view, to lay in for all the merit, if things turn out well, and to direct all offices and those who are at the head of them. I am determined to make a right use of what he flings out in these rants, and go my own way. I am taking more pains to get such a clear state of our present expenses, the means or difficulty in continuing them, to be laid before His Majesty and his ministers, than I believe ever was, and to be thus tutored by this gentleman, who knows little or nothing of the matter, is a little hard. However, I bear everything....I send your Lordship the account I have got of the whole expense of the army in all places, which, to be sure, will amount to eight millions. My Lord Anson says the navy will be at least 6 millions. The ordnance will come to £600,000. The £1,500,000 advanced for navy services on the credit of next year make in all £16,100,000, and there is Mr Pitt's £16,000,000 for fleet and army only, without one sixpence for other ordinary expenses. One would think it impossible to provide such an immense sum. But the truth is there is now happily a great deal of money in the Kingdom....The monstrous increase of the National Debt is a terrible consideration. [He has been turning in his thoughts every species of tax, and proposes an excise on wine to be collected from the dealers.] I find Mr Pitt will be very meddling in all these affairs, which will not lessen our difficulties....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 227, f. 189.] WIMPOLE, *September 28th*, 1760.

...I really believe from the turn of it that he meant no harm or impertinence by it....But you know his constant disposition to be busy and important in everything....I would humbly advise not to appear warm or *vif* upon these sallies of his. [The Duke must have his support in raising supplies in the House of Commons; he mentions several difficulties connected with the proposed excise on wine.]

[1] Above, p. 246.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Right Hon. William Pitt

[N. 227, f. 373; H. 75, f. 207; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 68.]

WIMPOLE, *September 29th*, 1760.

DEAR SIR,

[Takes the opportunity of Lord Anson's return to send back papers.] Permit me to profit of this occasion to acknowledge the great honour you do me by these communications, which I esteem as fresh marks of that confidence, whereof I am very proud. I wish it was in my power to make any return which might be agreeable to you, and at the same time useful to His Majesty's service. I own I never was more surprized in my life than at the style and turn of these two extraordinary pieces [the Spanish memorials], so different from what there was reason to expect from the mission of Mons. de Fuentes[1]; but what could not fail to strike the most was the previous and unprecedented appeal to the Court of France, avowed in the Memorial relating to the Newfoundland Fishery. Nothing could be more wise nor more agreeable to the King's dignity than the *réponse verbale* which you gave to the Spanish ambassador upon that point, the terms whereof are as forcible and yet as measured, as could possibly be invented[2]. One idea meant to be conveyed by that step, so unusual between friendly courts, I conjecture was that the Court of France was to be summoned as a witness to support the Spanish claim; that is, to overturn that title to an exclusive right which she pretended to sell to England, (if I may so express it) by the Treaty of Utrecht.

As to the other memorial, relating to the establishments on the coasts of Honduras, Mosquitos, etc., and the cutting of logwood, I am extremely glad that this method of a provisional instruction to my Lord Bristol to confer confidentially with Mons. Wall has been fallen upon. At the same time that the manner and turn of that paper disgust and offend one, I wish several parts of it were not too well founded upon the merits. In a case so delicate and embarrassing, there could not have been a more prudent and eligible part than such an intermediate step before a definitive answer is

[1] The new Spanish Ambassador.

[2] In this, surprise and regret were expressed at the announcement by the Count de Fuentes that a copy had been communicated to the French Court, and the note continued: "Je dois remarquer à V.E. qu'on ignore parfaitement le motif et l'objet d'une communication si extraordinaire envers une cour en guerre ouverte contre l'Angleterre, et qui d'ailleurs ne peut, en aucun temps, avoir à se mêler des prétentions espagnoles sur nous, pour la pêche de Terre-Neuve." Nor could it add any weight to the Spanish representations. H. 72, f. 58.

given, in order to sound and soften the Spanish minister, and try to find out how deeply these schemes have taken root in that Court, and from what motives. A more able letter could not possibly be drawn for this purpose, nor more judiciously adapted to the end. But I much fear that Mons. Wall's influence in the Court of Madrid is not the same as it has been, and that his having been represented as partial to England will make him too cautious and reserved to open himself upon such points. You may remember that from the first, I expressed great apprehensions upon the consequences of Mons. Ensenada's return, and I think I see marks of it in these papers and his hand in particular in one part, which I am sure cannot have escaped your correct attention. The enterprize, which was projected in the year 1754 against the English establishments on the River Wallis, is there represented as proceeding only from the Spanish Governors in America *in consequence of their general instructions*, whereas, according to my memory, Ensenada had procured King Ferdinand's signature to *special and particular orders* for that purpose, by surprise and imposition, without reading or opening the contents of them, and this was declared by Mons. Wall to have been avowed by his late Catholic Majesty himself[1]. If my memory does not much mislead me, it was one of the crimes for which he was disgraced and exiled; and I can hardly imagine that, if Mons. Wall had been master of the draft of this memorial, he would have given it this turn to make Mons. Ensenada's apology for him[2].

I hear continually from my friend, the Duke of Newcastle, how harmoniously you go on together, which gives me the greatest pleasure. I have also heard that you are making a very interesting operation in your family by inoculating some of your children. I know how affecting a crisis that must be to the mind of so tender a parent, and beg leave to offer my sincerest vows for the happy success of it.

I am always, with sentiments of the utmost respect and truth,

Dear Sir,

Your most obedient and most humble Servant,

HARDWICKE.

[1] Richard Wall (1694–1778), of Irish family, had served in the Spanish army and navy; ambassador in London 1748–1752; became foreign minister at the Spanish Court 1754, and for a long time represented the party favourable to England and opposed to French influence, which however now became too strong for him to resist; resigned 1764.

[2] Don Zenon de Somodevilla, marquis de la Ensenada (1702–1781); Secretary of State and chief minister 1743, and zealous supporter of the French interest and alliance; dismissed 1754, and failed to regain his power on the accession of Charles III in 1759.

Right Hon. William Pitt to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 75, f. 209.] St James's Square, *October 2nd*, 1760.

My Lord,

Lord Anson brought me the honour of a letter from your Lordship which has filled me with the most sensible satisfaction, and for which I beg leave to return my most sincere and respectful acknowledgments. Feeling, as I do, all the difficulty and the consequence of every step in our present affairs with Spain, very much was wanting to my ease of mind till the instruction to Lord Bristol, tho' it had not been disapproved here, received the sanction of a judgment I so justly revere, and which your Lordship has had the goodness to convey to me in terms that ought to make, and do indeed make me, both proud and happy. I hope, however, I shall not be made vain too, at least so far as not to feel more and more every hour that I am little equal to the situation of things, where difficulties are daily growing and clouds gathering, in the midst of prosperity and glory. That harmony, at which your Lordship is so good as to express pleasure and which gives me so much, can alone, if anything can, carry the King's affairs thro' to a happy conclusion.

I cannot conclude the trouble I am now giving without expressing with a parent's sensibility, my warmest thanks for the very kind wishes your Lordship entertains for the success of the anxious undertaking in which we are engaged with our two little girls. They both have begun this day to be ailing and, thank God, with symptoms hitherto favourable.

Accept my truest wishes that health and every satisfaction may attend your Lordship and all yours.

I am ever, with the highest respect and perfect truth,

Your Lordship's most obedient and obliged humble Servant,

W. Pitt.

[On October 3, 1760 (N. 227, f. 323; H. 72, f. 67), the Duke of Newcastle complains to Lord Hardwicke of Pitt's projected expedition of 5000 men against Belleisle, to which he has strong objections, and desires Lord Hardwicke's opinion.] It is a cruel thing to be left alone, to be scoffed at by a Lord Holderness or overrun by the torrent of his colleague.

[Lord Hardwicke replies on October 5 (N. 227, f. 369; H. 72, f. 74), condemning the project as impracticable, ill-timed, too late to be of the service expected, holding out little hope of success, and dangerously weakening the small force left in the country.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 228, f. 207.] WIMPOLE, *October 19th*, 1760.

...As to the expedition, I collect from Mr Pitt's conversation with your Grace, that it will be laid aside....Your Grace says his view is "to fling upon you the non-execution of his impracticable scheme." If that be so, it will be a very bad part, and 'tis very unfair dealing between brother ministers. But it has often happened, and I know no way of supporting oneself against it but by the consciousness of one's own integrity, and avowing what one is convinced is right. Besides, in this case, I flatter myself it will be the opinion of every sensible unprejudiced man in the Kingdom[1].

Lord Anson to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 11, f. 434.] *October 25th*, 1760.

MY DEAR LORD,

I had a note two hours ago with the melancholy account of the King's death, upon which I went immediately to Kensington. ...The King's servant says he never looked better than when he gave him his chocolate at seven this morning; that about half an hour afterwards, hearing an unusual noise in the room, he ventured to open the door, which he had never done before, that he found His Majesty dropped...and struggling for life, which lasted but a few minutes....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 228, f. 334.] WIMPOLE, Saturday night, 9 o'clock.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I this moment received a most melancholy billet from the Bishop of Bristol, containing no more than that our good King and most gracious master, died this morning about seven o'clock, and that your Grace desires me immediately to come to town. I...am to the last degree surprised and afflicted with this sudden, fatal and distressful event, upon which I do most heartily condole with your Grace and all His Majesty's faithful subjects and servants. I pray God to preserve you. Pray take care of your health and keep up your spirits, for the sake of the public and your friends.

I will obey your Grace's commands with as much despatch as

[1] See further on Sir Edward Hawke's opposition to the project, f. 326; and *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Earl of Donoughmore, 229 and see above, p. 117 *n*, and below, p. 267.

possibly I can. I have had a very bad cold myself which is not yet gone; and my wife has been very ill of late, so that I must give some directions for the care of her in my absence[1]. This necessarily hinders me from setting out so early as tomorrow morning, but I intend (God willing) to be in Grosvenor Square on Monday evening....I am so shocked with this dismal news, that I can add no more but my prayers for you and this poor country and the sincerest assurances that, in any event, I am with unfeigned and inviolable attachment and affection, my dearest Lord,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 228, f. 399.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *October 28th*, 1760.

MY DEAR DEAR FRIEND,

You will not wonder that I have neither time nor spirits to write to you, having lost the best King, the best Master and the best Friend that ever subject had. God knows what consequences it may have. The young King promises everything that is good, and should make his people happy. Nothing is yet settled or declared with regard to the administration. It is a pleasure to see that all ranks of people shew the greatest disposition to support His Majesty and his government. In all situations and stations, I am, my dear dear friend, to you and yours, a most affectionate and faithful servant,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. I thank you for all your letters, but I have not had time to read them.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 10, f. 128.] HAGUE, *October 31st*, 1760.

MY LORD,

I am too much overcome with surprise and grief upon the unfortunate and unexpected death of the good King to be able to say much to anybody. God's will be done! but it is a heavy stroke, and makes a great impression upon everybody....My heart is full when I reflect upon the partial goodness of our late royal Master to me, and I pray God to bless his present Majesty, and to make him as great a King and as much beloved and respected....

[1] Lady Hardwicke died next year on September 19.

CHAPTER XXX

GEORGE III AND THE FALL OF THE WHIGS

THE strange uncertainty that attends all human affairs was perhaps never more strikingly manifested than in the events which followed the death of George II. The administration, whose strength and energy had achieved the conquests and victories already related and which was engaged, apparently with every prospect of success, in the work of securing and fixing permanently the great empire now acquired, was suddenly struck down and annihilated. All those elements which have been noted as contributing to, and alone rendering possible, the British triumphs, were broken up and dissipated. The union and co-operation between the ministers in the Cabinet were destroyed. The mutual confidence between the Parliament and the government, between the nation and the administration, and between the King and his ministers disappeared. The popularity and strength of the Throne were once more shaken. The solid financial foundations of the country were weakened. The great men, whose wisdom, character and statesmanship, supported by the whole Parliament and nation, had made England speak with one mighty voice and had guided the destinies of the country to victories beyond the dreams of national ambition, were interrupted in their labours and driven from the scene. All the forces and resources of the country, which we have seen with such marvellous results happily united and concentrated upon the one great aim, were again scattered and divided, and wasted upon barren domestic discussions. The great mission of Britain in the world was now interrupted and ceased. Instead of the great topics, which fill the annals of the reign of George II, the historian has to employ his pen in recording petty internal dissensions and intrigues, till the general disorganisation and confusion bring the nation to the brink of ruin and shatter the newly gained colonial empire.

The time, it has been argued, and it may be admitted, had now arrived, when the Tories, no longer Jacobites[1], might safely be granted a share in the administration, and when the Whig monopoly of power, which had lasted for so many years and which had secured to the nation so many blessings, might yield to a broader foundation of government. But this was far from being the real character of the new system now inaugurated. The object was not a change of parties but their total destruction and suppression. The Tories were admitted to the ministry, not from any large or liberal policy, but because of their high and narrow notions of prerogative, and in order to establish the sole power of the Crown.

The young King had been deplorably trained and prepared for the great sphere of his future life. On the death of his father, owing to the hostility displayed by the Duke of Cumberland towards the Whig administration, he had been allowed to remain with the Princess of Wales, instead of being lodged in the King's palace[2], and the ministers lost all control over his education. He was bred up in an atmosphere of intrigue and dissimulation. He imbibed early the maxims of Bolingbroke's *Patriot King* and the unfortunate principles diligently instilled into him by the Princess of Wales and Lord Bute. The Whig party was represented "as having from a levelling republican party degenerated into an aristocratical faction, who kept his grandfather in chains and were determined to make a mere pageant of the throne[3]." The young King, therefore, on his accession, in accordance with long-prepared plans, had resolved to shake off immediately all ministerial control, "to be King," as the Princess of Wales impressed upon him, to govern as well as reign, as an independent sovereign with the aid of subordinate servants, responsible, not to the nation or to Parliament, but to himself alone.

Such a system, whatever may be its ideal advantages, so often argued with force by those who feel the absurdities and mischiefs of party and parliamentary government, entailed as a consequence the disappearance and exclusion from office of all the great men of tried experience, ability and character for whom there was now

[1] "The Pretender's eldest son," writes Stanley, the British envoy at Paris, to Pitt, June 9, 1761, "is drunk as soon as he rises, and is always senselessly so at night, when his servants carry him to bed. He is not thought of even by the exiles." Thackeray's *Chatham*, i. 522. He had visited England and the government had not thought it worth while to take any notice of his presence.

[2] Above, vol. ii. 45; Coxe's *Pelham*, ii. 167.

[3] *Lord Shelburne's Life*, by Lord Fitzmaurice, i. 68; *Duke of Grafton's Autobiog.* i. 13.

no longer room, and an administration, which totally and deliberately deprives itself of such, stands self-condemned. The government of parties and of great men was succeeded, not by that of one great man but by that of a swarm of little ones, of favourites, "King's friends," ciphers and nonentities. Lord Bute, who now obtained the chief power, was a well-intentioned Scottish nobleman, faithfully devoted to the young King's supposed interests and who possessed many good domestic qualities. "He was in every respect," writes a contemporary, "adapted to the small circle of a coal fire; here his virtues were known and his sincere attachments made him amiable[1]." But he had no experience whatever, apart from petty intrigues, in public affairs, was endowed with no political or parliamentary abilities, and had never opened his mouth in either House of Parliament, where he had occupied no seat for twenty years. He was a person of unpopular manners and of unpopular nationality, suspected of scandalous relations with the Sovereign's mother. He owed his strange elevation, it was said, to a chance shower of rain which threw him into the society of Frederick, Prince of Wales, and to a pair of handsome legs, which had compelled the admiration of the Princess. Such was the successor of the great Pitt, who now filled a place by the favour of the Sovereign alone, such as had not been occupied since the misgovernment of the ill-fated Buckingham. The unscrupulous and unprincipled Fox was again placed in power, employed in directing the system of corruption and intimidation now introduced and rewarded with a peerage and an immense fortune. On the Woolsack appeared the servile and second-rate Lord Henley, while to succeed Lord Hardwicke as High Steward of Cambridge University, the whole weight of the royal influence was employed in order to exclude his eldest son and to bring in Lord Sandwich, a man not only of notorious morals but who was destitute even of the honour known among thieves and who, to serve a political turn, had betrayed the ill-doings of his associates. Statesmen of the stamp of the Dukes of Newcastle and Devonshire, of weight and character, were expelled; and their places were taken by such persons as the well-meaning but pedantic George Grenville, or the too celebrated Lord George Sackville, whom the King made haste to receive at Court and was only prevented from at once admitting to office by the strength of the national feeling against him[2]. The

[1] *Hist. of the late Minority*, 63; cf. Lord Shelburne's character of him, *Life*, i. 139.
[2] *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 231; *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Mrs Stopford Sackville, i. 58–9.

ridiculous and notorious Sir Francis Dashwood, founder of the half crazy Medmenham Fraternity, was chosen Chancellor of the Exchequer in the place of the able and successful Legge, who had never been forgiven for having formerly refused to resign his seat in Parliament at the bidding of the Prince of Wales and Lord Bute[1]. The Duke of Rutland, who held the dignified office of Lord Steward, was obliged to give way to Lord Talbot, a noted prize fighter, a man of low morals and eccentric manners, who had occasionally indecorously interrupted the debates in the Lords,—an appointment which Lord Hardwicke indignantly declared to be contrary to the King's public professions regarding religion and virtue[2]. Rogues and adventurers of the type of Shebbeare left the pillory and came to Court to be rewarded[3]. Intrigues were instigated in the East India Company against the great Clive[4]. The illustrious Princes of the House of Brunswick were rewarded for their glorious services by neglect and insults. The King of Prussia was abandoned. The career of the amiable and gifted Charles Yorke was ruined and himself hurried into an early grave.

The young King who ascended the throne, says Walpole, with more advantages than any previous British Sovereign, seemed, by the universal joy which greeted his accession, by the happy public circumstances in which it took place and by his own domestic virtues, conscientious devotion to duty, piety and courage, to have been granted to the nation by Providence, in order to continue and complete the glories and triumphs of his grandfather's reign and to inaugurate a new period of domestic prosperity and happiness. He possessed those particular personal British qualities, and indeed those very faults and prejudices, which were most likely to render him beloved among the people. His education even had been characteristically English, if we may believe Walpole; for at the age of eleven he could not read his native language, but could make Latin verses[5]. He could not, it was said, find Hanover on the map. He "gloried in the name of Briton." His rule, however, in reality began under the worst and most unfavourable auspices, of which the full import was only gradually unfolded, and of which the whole tragedy was not completed till the Sovereign had sunk

[1] *Hist. of the late Minority*, 17 sqq.

[2] N. 235, f. 119; Walpole's *George III*, i. 11; *Grenville Papers*, i. 357, and see above, vol. i. 252 *n.*

[3] He was granted a pension of £200 by the King's order in 1764.

[4] Sir J. Malcolm, *Mem. of Clive*, ii. 210; and see below, p. 488.

[5] *George II*, i. 80.

into blindness and insanity, as if exhibiting in his person those characteristics that chiefly marked his reign.

Besides the change arising from these great political developements, the advent of a new King to the throne, scarcely more than a boy and belonging to a different generation, brought up in another atmosphere and in one of distrust and hostility[1], necessarily terminated those close personal relations between the Sovereign and Lord Hardwicke which had existed for so many years.

None of these changes, however, either political or personal, took place immediately. It was one of the chief principles of the system of the new Court, long settled and decided, to govern by dividing, never to recognize or deal with groups or parties but always with individuals on personal grounds, as if independent of any ties of association. Not only in this manner would the Whig leaders be got rid of easily and without danger, but going into opposition singly and jealous of one another, they would remain disunited and incapable of offering resistance of any strength to the policy of the Crown.

For some time it was doubtful which minister would be first attacked and sacrificed. "He [Lord Bute] said it was very easy to make the Duke of Newcastle resign...," writes Bubb Dodington. "He did not seem to think it advisable to begin there....He began to think with me that it was possible Pitt might resign[2]."

Lord Hardwicke was at first treated by the King with "the greatest respect and regard," and his advice and support were sought and enlisted as in the past; while Lord Bute, amidst great protestations of cordiality and goodwill, pressed upon him the acceptance of office[3]. This he waived, but at the same time, encouraged by these favourable appearances, "continued," in the words of his son, the envoy at the Hague, "to give his helping hand without place or pension[4]," and to sign public documents. "My Father," he wrote on April 3, 1761, during a visit to London, "is younger and more active, as well as gayer, than any one of his contemporaries; he really looks like a healthy man of fifty, tho' to my sorrow he is in his 71st year. He is in high favour with his country and the peace-maker upon all occasions; it is a glorious end of life[5]."

"In the beginning of the new reign," writes Lord Royston[6], "no

[1] See vol. ii. 297.
[2] *Diary*, 387.
[3] N. 229, ff. 64, 82, and below.
[4] *Chat. Corr.* ii. 82.
[5] Bentinck Papers, Egerton MSS. 1862, f. 105.
[6] H. 80, f. 1.

apparent alteration happened in our situation; we were even cajoled and courted for the first weeks of it. Mr [Charles] Yorke had an audience of the King within the first twenty-four hours of his accession, [and received emphatic assurances of royal support[1]] and was desired to hasten my Father up to town. Lord Bute made an offer to the latter of the President's place very soon after his coming up, and said the King considered Lord Granville as worn out and was determined to lay him aside. My Father absolutely declined the proposal; assured Lord Bute that he chose to serve His Majesty out of office; that if his family partook at any time of the King's goodness, it was all he desired or wished for at his time of life. An honourable cushion at the Privy Council was bestowed on me, upon the first intimation that it would be agreeable[2]. Mr John Yorke was soon brought into the Board of Trade [March 21, 1761]....Sir Joseph, [who paid a visit to England of some months, arriving on March 21, 1761, and was returned M.P. for Dover, promoted to Lieutenant-General the same year, and well received by the King], had the red Ribband [March 23, 1761] and was in the course of 1761 appointed Plenipotentiary to Augsburg and Ambassador Extraordinary to the States General. [James Yorke, Lord Hardwicke's youngest son, was appointed Dean of Lincoln in January 1762[3].] In short, the exterior was fair and plausible, but in reality Lord Bute had the sole power and influence, and he was determined to work out the old servants of the Crown as soon as he could possibly bring it about, notwithstanding the many difficulties that seemed to stand in the way of it. How he accomplished this great task, which has made him ever since so unhappy a man, is not within the compass of this paper.... It will suffice to mention here that Lord Bute principally availed himself, and with great art and finesse, of the dissensions between the Duke of Newcastle and Mr Pitt; that he played off one against the other occasionally, till he had got rid of the popular minister; and when that was compassed, he strengthened himself in the Cabinet by bringing in Lord Eg[re]mont and Mr Grenville, and never left intriguing and undermining till he had rendered it impracticable for the old Duke to continue in office with credit or honour."

[1] Below, pp. 305, 307.

[2] Below, pp. 312, 315; the moving of the address of thanks in the Commons was allotted to him; his speech printed in *Parl. Hist.* xv. 988.

[3] Vol. ii. 577.

On the death of the old King Lord Hardwicke had immediately, at the urgent summons of the Duke of Newcastle, returned to London; and in spite of fair appearances and the favourable reception given both to himself and to the Duke at Court, and the assurances of Lord Bute, he advised the Duke strongly and without hesitation to retire from office and to close his political career, as he desired and intended to close his own[1]. During the whole of his long friendship and connection with Newcastle, he had probably never given more sagacious counsel. But with the exception of Count Viry, and of Andrew Stone—the Duke's former Secretary, and a man of rare political insight—Lord Hardwicke was alone in this opinion. The Whig party and leaders, including the Dukes of Devonshire and Bedford, urged strongly the Duke of Newcastle's retention of office[2]. Pitt expressed his ardent wishes that he should continue, declared it a "necessity," gave very full assurances of his desire to act in concert, and yielded on the subject of the renewal of the Militia Act[3]. Strong representations in the same sense came from the city[4]. No other man could give stability to the national finances. Lord Bute, in the King's name, hoped that he "would not abandon the service of his country at so critical a conjuncture[5]"; and made strong professions of friendship and support. "It was a call to government so universal, it was not to be resisted," wrote Lord Barrington, "even in the opinion of those who thought he should retire[6]." "All sorts of people," said Fox, "great and little, friends and enemies, conspired in saying and insisting that the Duke of Newcastle's remaining where he was, was absolutely necessary[7]."

It would have required a man of a very different constitution from the Duke of Newcastle, to whom the possession of office had for 50 years been the breath of his life, to resist persuasions of such force and to yield up voluntarily the whole of his political power at the very time when it appeared at its highest. The Duke succumbed; and, probably for the first time in his life, disregarded the advice of his great friend and Mentor, consented to remain at the head of the administration, and allowed himself to be drawn into the net prepared for him. Having failed to effect his retirement,

[1] Below, pp. 305–7.
[2] Wiffen's *House of Russell*, ii. 466; N. 228, f. 412.
[3] Below, pp. 308–9; N. 229, f. 64; H. 75, ff. 212, 214; N. 230, ff. 131–8.
[4] Below, p. 309.
[5] Below, p. 306.
[6] To Mitchell, January 5, 1761, Add. 6834, f. 28.
[7] *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 8.

Lord Hardwicke took steps to secure, if possible, the Duke's power and credit in the new ministry, and in two long interviews with Pitt and with Bute impressed upon them the necessity of giving proper authority and support to the Duke and the Treasury[1]. The choice of the next Parliament was promised to him, and the King said: "I thank you for remaining in your employment. I know your zeal and abilities. I will not only give you my countenance and support to enable you to carry on my business, but such as shall be sufficient to make you happy and easy. My friend, my Lord Bute, shall be my guarantee, or to that purpose[2]."

There were, however, soon signs that an entire breach with the past was intended. The King, on the occasion of the Duke of Newcastle's first audience, avoided all topics of business and told him that Lord Bute, who now entered the Cabinet as Groom of the Stole, "would tell him his thoughts at large[3]." The King's public declaration to the Council, according to Lord Shelburne prepared long beforehand for the occasion[4], was drawn up without any consultation with the responsible ministers. All mention of the King's allies was omitted, and in it such expressions as "bloody and expensive war" were employed,—objectionable terms, which by Pitt's insistence were altered to "an expensive but just and necessary war[5]." In November, Lord Hardwicke drew up once more the King's Speech, which, with the one exception during Pitt's short temporary administration in 1756, he had composed every year since his accession to the Woolsack[6]. It was now, however, returned by Lord Bute with an intimation that the King desired the insertion of the famous sentence, written by himself, beginning, "Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Britain[7]." The phrase was construed by many as a reflection upon the deceased sovereign and was compared to Queen Anne's speech on a like occasion, when she spoke of herself as "entirely English[8]." Lord

[1] Below, pp. 309, 319. "Lord H. advised the Duke to make stipulations for power....Strange advice of Lord Hardwicke's, indeed absurd, not followed, and I hear Lord Hardwicke thinks the D. of N's administration for that reason, I suppose, unstable. Lord H. is much courted, hated and despised." Fox's Autobiog., *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 9.

[2] N. 228, f. 453.

[3] Below, p. 304.

[4] *Life*, by Lord Fitzmaurice, i. 43.

[5] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 978; Walpole's *George III*, i. 8; below, p. 305.

[6] Below, p. 310; H. 521, ff. 227, 334; H. to Pitt, *Chat. Corr.* ii. 81.

[7] Below, p. 311; Add. 32684, f. 121; see also Sir G. Rose, *Diaries and Corres.* ii. 189.

[8] *Parl. Hist.* vi. 5; *Chatham Corres.* ii. 82; H. 17, f. 246.

Hardwicke, however, does not appear to have viewed it in this light, or else thought it wiser to give a generous interpretation to the words than to censure or oppose them. He incorporated them without demur in the Speech, only changing the word *Britain* to *Briton*[1], and immediately composed a new paragraph in reply, for insertion in the Lords' Address, which ran in true courtier-like terms: "What a lustre does it cast upon the name of Briton, when you, Sir, are pleased to esteem it among your glories[2]!"

In the new session, which opened in March 1761, a royal message to Parliament provided that the tenure of judicial office should no longer be determined, as hitherto, by the death of the Sovereign. This measure, the principle of which had been established at the Revolution, effected the complete independence of the Bench, and was strongly supported by Lord Hardwicke, who moved the Address of Thanks to the King on March 3, 1761[3].

The occasion provided a good opportunity, not only of showing the necessity for the change, but of praising the young King who, of his own free will, and without any pressure from his subjects, now granted away this prerogative of the Crown. Lord Hardwicke concluded his speech, perhaps in answer to the recent unjustifiable attacks upon the Bench, by pronouncing an eulogy upon the whole administration of the Law of England, contrasting it with that in other European States, where the Judges maintained their places only during the pleasure of the Sovereign, or else obtained them—whether qualified or not—by legal purchase, where solicitation of the Judges was a notorious and permitted practice and where the reasons for their judgments were not given publicly and openly. This last obligation upon the English Judges he had always regarded as one great security for the proper administration of justice in this country; for there would always be some persons whom no scruple of conscience would prevent from giving a wrong

[1] The original "Britain" was ridiculed by Wilkes as a slip in Lord Bute's spelling. *Wilkes Corr.* i. 84, iii. 131.

[2] Below, p. 312. According to J. Nicholls, *Recollections*, i. 2, "the old Earl of Hardwicke, the ex-chancellor, censured this expression, saying that it was an insult to the memory of the late King," but the evidence seems to point to the contrary. *Parl. Hist.* xv. 982; favourable allusion was also made to it by Lord Royston in moving the address in the Commons, 993.

[3] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1008, where the notes of Lord H.'s speech are printed. It might have been thought that the terms of the Judges' patents, *quam diu se bene gesserint*, were sufficient to extend their tenure of office into the new reigns, but it had been otherwise decided, and at the deaths of Will. III and Anne, as well as those of George I and George II, one judge or more had been omitted from the new commissions.

judgment in silence and in private, who yet would be ashamed to talk nonsense publicly to the world[1].

On July 8, Lord Hardwicke was summoned to a Council to hear the King's unexpected announcement of his intended marriage with Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz. He was present at the great Levée, held on the morning after the nuptial ceremony, which took place on September 6, 1761, when, according to Walpole, he amused the company by replying to the King's formal remark upon the weather—"It is a very fine day"—"Yes, sir; and it was a very fine night[2]." The death of Lady Hardwicke, however, prevented his attendance and that of "the whole house of Yorke" at the Coronation ceremonies, which followed on September 22[3].

Meanwhile, the influence of Bute had been steadily increasing and that of the Whig ministers waning in proportion. The King identified himself completely with his favourite, and in January 1761, he told the Duke of Argyll, "Whoever speaks against my Lord Bute, I shall think speaks against me." "The late King," Lord Hardwicke observed on this extraordinary declaration of the Sovereign, never, even with regard to Sir Robert Walpole, "condescended to use such a language; nay, would have been very angry had anybody imputed it to him. Such things should be told to very few[4]." The Duke of Newcastle very soon discovered that the King's promises were valueless and that it was not intended to give him any real share of power or of government. The King transacted no business with him and in November he had already found himself "the greatest cypher that ever appeared at Court"; "not even my Lord Wilmington." By December, it was evident that he would be allowed no free hand in "choosing the Parliament," and that no money would be granted to him for the purpose from the King's Civil List, which was, indeed, employed in bringing in members devoted to the Court[5].

Lord Bute, says the second Lord Hardwicke, alternately "mortified the Duke of Newcastle and Mr Pitt to show his power[6]." Besides being disunited by suspicions as to each other's motives

[1] See Bute to H., March 4, 1761: "Your Lordship will permit me to express the great pleasure a certain performance in the House of Lords yesterday gave me; I have heard but one voice concerning it, and I found *no one* did it more justice than him [the King] whose *praise* will, I hope, (as in this case) be ever directed to an object worthy of it." H. 75, f. 260.

[2] *Letters*, v. 108. [3] *Ib.* 116.

[4] N. 232, ff. 90, 96; and *Grenville Papers*, ii. 22.

[5] Below, p. 310; H. 72, f. 134; N. 230, ff. 332, 359.

[6] H. 73, f. 20.

and intentions in the new scene, the Duke and Pitt were divided on the policy of war and peace, and on this important point the Duke of Newcastle found Bute more in agreement with his own opinions. Thus there was little prospect of any solid or effectual resistance to the new plans of the government. Great pains, moreover, were taken to avoid driving them into concerted action against the Court, and every art was employed in fomenting the jealousies between them. In December 1760, Lord Bute, in concert with Pitt, and without consulting the Duke of Newcastle or Lord Hardwicke, made a number of Tory appointments. Lord Bute's own nomination to be Secretary of State had from the moment of the King's Accession been decided upon[1], but instead of receiving his new office openly from the King, every means was employed to obtain it as a measure initiated and supported by the Duke of Newcastle and his friends, without the knowledge or sanction of Pitt. When Count Viry, Lord Bute's confidant, made the proposal on January 18, 1761, the Duke of Newcastle insisted that the appointment could not be made without Pitt's full approbation and concurrence[2]. A day or two later the Duke of Newcastle listened to Pitt for nearly an hour expatiating on the impossibility of "a Favourite or a certain particular person to be minister[3]." Subsequently, however, in February, Viry communicated, by Bute's order, to the Duke some strong assurances of support made by Lord Temple in his own and Pitt's name, who looked upon Lord Bute not as the "bare Groom of the Stole," but as "a minister"; and in reply to the Duke's fears of exciting jealousy in Pitt's mind by his exclusion from the transaction it was intimated clearly that if he, the Duke himself, did not undertake to propose the appointment to the King, it would be done through Lord Temple, who would conclude it in a manner distasteful to him, and in the new arrangements would throw more influence into Pitt's hands. The appointment of Bute had long been regarded by the Whig lords as inevitable and advisable. "The administration," writes the Duke of Grafton, "though unaltered, soon perceived that their advice was not attended to with that deference, which was shewn to that of others who were consulted in private, and it was considered to be wiser and less dangerous that Lord Bute should himself hold a Cabinet office[4]." In these circumstances, the Duke

[1] N. 234, f. 485. [2] N. 232, f. 462. [3] H. 72, f. 169.

[4] *Autobiog.* 14; according to J. Nicholls, *Recollections*, i. 8, another motive was the imprudence of opposing the King's wishes.

of Newcastle, with the approval of Lord Hardwicke and the Duke of Devonshire, who regarded the step as one likely to strengthen the administration, went through the farce, in a well-rehearsed interview with the King, on March 6, without any previous concert with Pitt, of proposing Lord Bute's appointment; and Bute himself informed Pitt on March 13, silencing all Pitt's inconvenient questions by stating the measure as the King's own act. Lord Holderness showed great complaisance in quitting office on this occasion, and was amply rewarded with a pension of £4000 a year and a reversion of the Cinque Ports[1]. Legge, the able and successful Chancellor of the Exchequer, was turned out and replaced by Lord Barrington, a man of good character but of no ability in finance, and who did not conceal his surprise at his new situation. The latter was succeeded at the War Office by the corrupt Charles Townshend.

A firm alliance was supposed now to be cemented between Bute and the Duke of Newcastle and his friends. Bute expressed great satisfaction at the assistance which he had received, and, on March 10, he asked for and obtained a promise of support in case of difference with Pitt, a person who could never be agreeable to the King, and with whom, he insinuated, he only continued to work, in deference to the Duke of Newcastle's wishes. A warning note is sounded by Lord Hardwicke the same day, who suggests that Lords Bute and Temple were in closer connexion than was imagined, and that Pitt was not unprepared for the news of Bute's appointment[2]. Indeed, the union and understanding with the Duke of Newcastle were merely for appearance, to secure the support of one faction of the Whigs and to create jealousy in the other, and led to no real co-operation; for the Duke a short time afterwards complains of the same ill-treatment and exclusion from power as before[3]. The great object was to sow the seeds of suspicion and distrust between Pitt and Newcastle, which was accomplished with only too complete a success.

[1] "Lord Holderness was ready at his [Bute's] desire to quarrel with his fellow ministers...and go to the King and throw up in seeming anger, and then he (Bute) might come in without seeming to displace anybody." Dodington's *Diary*, 371 sqq. The worthless Bubb Dodington himself was made Lord Melcombe.

[2] N. 234, ff. 285, 316, 400 sqq., 408, 421, 477, 481, 521; N. 235, ff. 64, 72, 166; also f. 119, H. to N. declining absolutely to be the envoy to announce the news to Pitt; cf. also Fuentes to Wall, March 20 (*Chat. Corr.* ii. 101), "Your Excellency need not doubt of his [Pitt's] union with my Lord Bute, and that the present changes have been made with his privity."

[3] H. 73, ff. 20, 54; N. 242, f. 68; *Rockingham Mem.* i. 30.

A total divergence of opinion, moreover, with regard to the war now completed the breach between Pitt and Newcastle and provided the opportunity, without any further effort on the part of Bute, of promoting the King's political plans.

No backwardness as yet had appeared in the vigorous support of the military operations of which the King's Speech had declared the necessity. Supplies for the services, amounting to nearly 16 millions, including the renewal of the King of Prussia's subsidy of £670,000, were voted, and British troops, in numbers about 110,000, were maintained in various parts of the world, with 70,000 seamen and 60,000 Germans[1]. The expedition against Belleisle, proposed by Pitt in 1760 and opposed by the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke as well as by Hawke and Boscawen[2], met with success this year, the island being captured on June 7, but not without heavy loss, at the expense of the projected operations against Mauritius and in Germany and at the cost, it was said, of nearly a million[3]. The island of Dominica, in the West Indies, was captured in June, and Pondicherry had fallen into the possession of the British on January 16. The fortune of war, after a victory gained over the French at Vellinghausen on July 15 and 16, left Prince Ferdinand almost in the same position at the end as at the beginning of the campaign. Frederick of Prussia, since his great victory over the Austrians at Torgau on November 3, 1760, had met with little success. Though the French were still kept off, large armies of Russians and Austrians again invaded his territories with whom he was too weak to engage. Schweidnitz, the strongest fortress in Silesia, was surprised by the Austrians on October 1, 1761, and on December 1 Colberg in Pomerania by the Russians: and thus both the Russians and Austrians were enabled to winter in his dominions. Meanwhile, the continued disasters to the French arms elsewhere, the collapse of their trade and navy and the impoverishment of their country compelled them to turn again to hopes of peace. Once more Frederick urged the renewal of the

[1] Bisset, *George III*, i. 270.

[2] Above, p. 252; Stowe MSS. 263, f. 17.

[3] Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 371 sqq.; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 69; Fortescue, *Hist. of the British Army*, ii. 521; below, p. 311. Sir Joseph Yorke writes to the D. of N., October 20, 1761, while urging the necessity of strengthening the forces in Germany, "All Europe wonders at the force we have kept this year at Belleisle without a single attempt even to alarm the French coasts...whilst such a reinforcement to Prince Ferdinand would have turned the scale in our favour." N. 244, f. 387.

separate negotiations between England and France[1]; and Pitt now made the exclusion of the King of Prussia and of the continental war a *sine qua non* in the negotiations, a stipulation which, when made by the French the year before, he had treated as a pretext for breaking off, alleging in justification that he had in the present case the King of Prussia's consent which was withheld on the former occasion[2].

There appeared therefore every hope and expectation of peace. A congress at Augsburg between the five belligerent Powers was arranged in April, and Sir Joseph Yorke was appointed one of the British Plenipotentiaries[3]. At the same time a separate negotiation was begun between France and England, and Bussy[4], the French envoy, arrived in London at the beginning of June, while Hans Stanley[5] was despatched by Pitt to Paris to confer with Choiseul[6].

The conferences progressed at first favourably, the French yielding at once to all the required cessions of territory conquered from them, and a full agreement not being reached only on some minor though important points, such as the neutrality to be observed in Germany, the dates at which the principle of *uti possidetis* was to be applied, the compensation for prizes taken by England before the declaration of war, and the participation by the French in the Newfoundland Fisheries.

[1] Below, p. 314; F. to Mitchell; Add. 6843, f. 189; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xx. 530; N. 232, f. 88; H. 72, f. 154; N. 230, ff. 78, 400.

[2] H. 72, f. 274; but see above, p. 146.

[3] Frederick advised the Hague as the best place for the negotiations. "Là le Roi peut se faire servir de M. Yorke dont l'habileté, les lumières et la fidélité sont connues." *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xx. 158.

[4] François de Bussy (1699–1780), formerly a clerk in the French Foreign Office, and secretary to the Duc de Richelieu; promoted by Choiseul; the same person who, under the cipher 101, formerly, while agent of the French Court in England, had taken the money of the British Government and rendered some substantial services. (Waddington, *Louis XV et le Renversement des Alliances*, 101; *Quarterly Rev.* 190, p. 346; and above, vol. i. 245; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 333; see also Walpole's *Letters*, v. 58.) His movements were carefully followed during his stay in England and reported to Pitt. (*Chat. Corr.* ii. 126.) "A reasonable sum of money," writes Temple to Pitt, "...might perhaps...be placed in some hands for the use of Monr. de Bussy's own pocket and might tend to facilitate matters. I have heard that he is not quite so chaste as Penelope." (Chat. MSS. 61.) Frederick also ordered that attempts should be made to gain him. (*Pol. Corr.* xx. 416.) And the D. of N. endeavoured to renew the former relations. (*Quar. Rev.* 190, p. 354.)

[5] Hans Stanley (*c.* 1720–1780), of Paultons Park in Hampshire; M.P. for Southampton, afterwards P.C.; Ambassador at St Petersburg, Governor of Carisbrooke Castle and Cofferer of the Household. He committed suicide at Althorp in 1780.

[6] Stanhope, *Hist. of England*, iv. 345; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 361 sqq.; Thackeray's *Chatham*, i. 506 sqq., ii. 507 sqq.; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 327 sqq.; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 19 sqq.

The exclusion of the French from the Fisheries had been rightly made by Pitt a point of the greatest importance from the first on account of their great value as a nursery for the French navy. On December 3, 1760, in a conversation with the Duke of Newcastle, he had proposed as an equivalent the cession of Guadaloupe or Gorée or even of a part of Canada[1]. He told Lord Hardwicke that on the Fisheries "he had much set his heart[2]." But Choiseul had also set his heart on them for the same reasons, and was determined not to yield on this point. He told Stanley, "que la pêche est sa folie," and that if he gave up this, he would be stoned in the streets. "Donnez nous de la pêche," he declared, "et sauvez nous le point d'honneur pour Dunkerque, car ce n'est que cela, la paix est faite." Stanley reported to Pitt that the Fishery would never be given up[3]. France had not been reduced to such extremities as to be forced to submit to this demand. Moreover, such a move would raise great jealousy in other states and especially in Spain. Describing a conversation with Pitt on April 6, 1761, on the subject of the negotiations, Lord Hardwicke wrote to the Duke of Newcastle, "He raised the point of the Fishery....I spoke to him very freely on that subject; that I wished it as much as he; but Spain and all the rest of Europe would be against our engrossing such a monopoly, and I could not think it right to run the hazard of losing, or greatly delaying, this peace for it[4]." The event proved the wisdom of this counsel, which, however, was rejected by Pitt, who, on June 26, 1761, forwarded a despatch to Stanley at Paris in which the French proposals on many points were rejected, and in particular all participation in the Fisheries was refused and a rigid dismantling of Dunkirk according to the Treaty of Utrecht was demanded. This despatch proved the turning-point of the negotiations[5].

It will not be forgotten that France and Spain after, and in consequence of, the rupture by Pitt of the negotiations at the Hague, in May 1760, had resumed communications and had been

[1] Below, p. 314; see also Walpole, *George III*, i. 77.

[2] N. 236, f. 343.

[3] Below, pp. 320–1; Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 540, 542, 545, 565, 574, 585.

[4] H. 236, f. 343, and further below, p. 452. The D. of N.'s opinion was the same, N. 241, f. 281, partly printed in Lord Rockingham's *Mem.* i. 25; see also the Duke of Bedford's—*Bedford Corr.* ii. 24.

[5] Schaefer, ii. *b*, 349 sqq.; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 382.

drawing nearer together[1]. Choiseul had long been balancing between hopes of peace from England and hopes of support from Spain, inclining strongly to the former. He had entered the negotiations with every expectation of concluding the disastrous war, and at first gave a cold reception to the urgent representations of Grimaldi, the Spanish Ambassador at Paris. Pitt's despatch of June 26, 1761, now worked an immediate change in his policy. He drew at once nearer to Spain and warned Stanley that, if the war was prolonged, France would have new allies[2]. The despatch of July 15, 1761, accordingly, which conveyed the French proposals, was followed by a request for the settlement also of the Spanish grievances, couched in strictly moderate and inoffensive language which, however, could not conceal the gravity of this step, which had been taken by Louis XV's special intervention[3]. At the same time Choiseul informed Bussy that he was purposely delaying his despatches till the season for hostile attacks from England should be over[4]. To this Pitt returned a positive refusal on July 24, drawn up in peremptory terms, in which the tone of the conqueror was too crudely apparent, and which Bussy characterised, not without justification, as betraying the aversion of the Court of London to peace. To Lord Hardwicke the dictatorial style of the despatch seemed deplorable and exceeded, in his opinion, even those of Louis XIV at the height of his glory and insolence.

"It is expected," Pitt wrote in the despatch in reply to the representations concerning Spain, "that France will not at any time presume a right of intermeddling in such disputes"; while the French demand that, in case of a treaty with England, no further help should be given to Prussia, was rejected summarily as "implying an attempt upon the honour of Great Britain." The

[1] Above, p. 151; Thackeray's *Chatham*, i. 499 sqq., 560 sqq.; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 365.

[2] N. 248, f. 112; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 14, 17, 22, 35; Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 532 sqq., 585, 599, 600; the intercepted correspondence between Fuentes and Grimaldi and Stanley's Letters to Pitt, June 9 and September 2, in *Chat. Corr.* ii. 91 sqq. 124, 140; *Revue Hist.* 71, p. 7; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 335; see also below, p. 313; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xx. 307, 331, 638; Add. 6843, f. 188. Choiseul's *Memoir to Louis XV*, written after the event, in 1765, where he endeavours, in order to justify the wisdom of his conduct and policy, to make out that, despairing of obtaining terms from Pitt, he was working for a peace when the latter should be displaced, and to appropriate the credit for the Peace of Paris, is misleading and should be allowed little weight. It is printed in *Le Pacte de Famille*, by A. Soulange-Bodin, 243.

[3] Raxis de Flassan, vi. 409–10.

[4] Bourguet, *Études sur la Politique Étrangère du Duc de Choiseul*, 205.

aid given to Prussia was to be entirely unrestricted, while the French assistance to the Austrians was to be limited to 24,000 men[1]. This despatch, declared by Choiseul, on July 30, to be offensive both in form and matter, finally decided his policy. The resolution of the French Court, however, was to be concealed for a month longer, and for that purpose the negotiations were to be continued for that period[2]. He wrote the same day to Ossun, the French ambassador at Madrid, "Le temps de l'union des deux couronnes est arrivé," adding that he regarded the treaty between the two states as in fact signed[3].

The reply of Bussy, therefore, of August 5, written by Choiseul, followed by a declaration of August 10, without breaking off the negotiations, insisted once more on the union of interests between France and Spain[4]; and Bussy was privately instructed, in case the terms should be accepted, to bring forward the family compact between the two Powers. On August 15, Pitt, in spite of Lord Hardwicke's opposition and with the unwilling consent of the King[5], returned an angry answer, declaring all hopes of peace at an end, which was followed by a final despatch on August 16. In this, through the influence of Lord Hardwicke, who was persuaded that the peace could not be obtained without it and that the concession might be freed from serious inconveniences[6], a restricted right of fishing in the Gulf of St Lawrence, as well as the small island of St Pierre as a shelter, were granted[7], terms with which, as Stanley owned to Bute, had he been empowered to offer them earlier, he could have made the peace[8], but which came now much too late.

Lord Hardwicke has left a note of Pitt's speech and of the scenes in the Cabinet, where the minister's conduct of the negotiations was meeting with strong opposition.

"*St James's, Aug.* 14*th* 1761.—*Notes at meeting of the Lords*[9].

"Notes of a draft of the letter to Mr Bussy....

Mr P. "An answer of justification from England. But it is greatly within what may [be] called high in respect of such a letter from France. *If you think that in this letter the King's ultimatum*

[1] Schaefer, ii. *b*, 370–380; Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 554. [2] H. 73, f. 46.

[3] Bourguet, *Le Duc de Choiseul*, 225; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 357 sqq.

[4] N. 241, f. 269; H. 73, ff. 38, 40; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 396; *Revue Hist.* 71, pp. 15 and 17; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 385.

[5] Below, p. 320; *Chat. Corr.* ii. 136. [6] H. 530, f. 111.

[7] Below; Thackeray's *Chatham*, i. 544 sqq., ii. 507 sqq.; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1018 sqq.; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xx. 590.

[8] Below, pp. 321–2; N. 243, f. 440. [9] H. 522, f. 297.

is to be relaxed, you go further than I thought you intended to go yesterday.

"I won't take *a cobbled dra*[*f*]*t* upon alterations proposed by any person whatsoever*.

"This is all the draft that, in a case where my own safety is concerned, I will take.

"This is the only draft that I will make.

"I shall rely upon the King's support[1].

"*Lord Temple.* The divisions now rising in this Council.

"I once hoped for a *glorious* Peace.

"All I can hope for *now* is *not an inglorious* Peace.

"When France finds that the pulses of the King's servants begin to beat low, etc.

"*Like the case of the Peace of Utrecht*†.

"*St James's, August 24th* 1761.—*Short Notes*[2].

"Notes of the Memorial from France[3]. As to the Fishery of the Gulf, reconnu [?] to belong to France.

"The French will not fish upon the coasts belonging to Great Britain or dry their fish there, à moins d'accident.

"But hors ces deux exceptions, the French insist to fish in every part of the Gulf....

"*Mr P.* I thought the relaxations on the part of England[4] would produce greater obstinacy on the part of France.

"These relaxations have not only spoiled this treaty, but will spoil all future treaties.

"Have betrayed a weakness.

"This has produced those retractations on the part of France[5].

"Doubting whether we could raise the money—that bandied about the Kingdom[6].

"*Lord P. S.* [*Lord Temple*]. Asks two questions:—

"1. Whether we have any option?

"2. Whether any Lord has an opinion for further concessions, and what those concessions are?

"*Lord President* [*Lord Granville*]. Is not for making any further concessions, because thinks they will have no effect.

"Of opinion that not the relaxations, which he approves, have produced this effect, but the union formed with Spain.

"*Lord Anson.* Produces a state of the fleet [105 in all].

* Such insolence in the manner was scarce to be borne. H.

[1] Cf. Walpole's *George III*, i. 53. Pitt was supported on this point by Bute and the King.

† [In Lord H.'s handwriting] Just the contrary. [See also below, p. 320; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 36.]

[2] H. 522, f. 299. [3] Of August 5, *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1050.

[4] Pitt to Stanley, August 27, 1761, Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 605 sqq. Fishing in the Gulf of St Lawrence, north of the Island of St Pierre, was granted on August 16. (Above.)

[5] *Ib.* 606 sqq. and 558, 568, 583. [6] A hit at the Duke of Newcastle.

"*Mr P.*[1] In coming into the opinion of the other Lords, I only made choice of the lesser evil, to produce unanimity.

"In opinion clearly against giving any fishery, except that allowed by the Treaty of Utrecht upon Newfoundland.

"I defer my opinion to that of others.

"I am strongly for yielding the Isle of St Pierre preferably to Canso.

"Gives many reasons[2].

"If the French should reject and the war be continued, I had rather it should be with France and Spain jointly, than with France alone.

"*Lord Temple.* Will not be induced to give answers hair by hair, till the whole horse's tail is pulled out.

"*Note of one particular which was said by L[ord] H[ardwicke], August 24th* 1761[3].

"One thing has been mentioned by some Lords more than once already, and has been repeated this day, which I think it necessary to take a little notice of. They have said that in their own minds they still adhere to their original opinion, not to make any further concessions to France, particularly as to the fishery and an *abri*, to put an immediate end to the negotiation and to recall Mr Stanley; but that they have given up their opinions merely in compliance with other Lords and to procure an unanimity.

"It must be acknowledged that it is *great condescension* in those Lords who have made such a declaration. In so doing, they express the greatest deference towards others of the Council. But I am willing to think that this conduct proceeds in part from some degree of conviction; at least from a persuasion that the measure, they give way to, *is not hurtful to their country*. I carry it no further. Otherwise it is not a subject of condescension or compliance; it would be too much even for the purchase of unanimity.

"Every Lord is able to answer for his own opinion. Every one of you is better able to answer for his own opinion than I am, who am the least among your Lordships. But it is too much to be supposed answerable for the opinions of other Lords. It is a

[1] H. 522, f. 301.

[2] Pitt writes to Stanley, August 27, 1761: "Considerations of the greatest weight have determined against the cession of Canso [Conceau]; as that island and port, lying close on the British Continent of America, and particularly on that long disputed, and not yet well settled part thereof, Nova Scotia, seems in point of situation to be not less, but perhaps more dangerous in various respects to the British Colonies, than was Cape Breton or St John's." Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 604; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1069.

[3] H. 522, f. 303.

politeness of too great an extent and carries a weight along with it which, for my own part, I am not willing to take my share of."

Meanwhile, on August 15, the relations between France and Spain had been embodied in the secret alliance known as the Family Compact, which provided for the closest union between the two countries for purposes of defence and commerce, and engaged Spain to declare war upon England on May 1, 1762, in case the hostilities between England and France had not then been concluded, while France, in the contingency of war, made herself responsible for the claims of Spain upon England and ceded to her Minorca; in addition, the neutrality of Portugal was no longer to be permitted[1]. The fact, though not the exact details, of the treaty, became known to the British ministers through information from Stanley, and through the intercepted letters which passed between Fuentes and Grimaldi, the Spanish ministers in London and Paris. Lord Bristol, instructed by Pitt to make energetic remonstrances at Madrid and demand explanations of the warlike preparations, received as reply, on August 28, only an explicit avowal of the mutual understanding between France and Spain, to which assurances of innocent intentions were added[2].

Finally, after several prolonged meetings of the Council and a fruitless conference between Pitt and Bussy[3], Pitt on September 17, with the full concurrence now of Lord Hardwicke, Bute and the Duke of Devonshire, though the Duke of Newcastle still clung to hopes of peace, broke off once more the negotiations. He further, in the Council held the next day, demanded an immediate declaration of war against Spain. On this point he was opposed by the whole Cabinet except Lord Temple, and the memorandum drawn up by them was outvoted by the rest of the ministers, who advised that before the declaration of war, Lord Bristol should be ordered to make one further attempt in Madrid to preserve peace[4] and substituted, at Lord Hardwicke's suggestion, another of a temporising character.

[1] Raxis de Flassan, vi. 314 sqq.; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 382.

[2] Thackeray's *Chatham*, i. 570 sqq.; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 364 sqq.; Chatham MSS. 93; N. 241, f. 265; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1129 sqq.

[3] See pp. 320 sqq.; Walpole's *George III*, i. 54; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 388; *Revue Hist.* 71, p. 24.

[4] See pp. 322 sqq.; H. 522, f. 306; N. 243, f. 248.

Paper signed by Lord Temple and Mr Pitt and delivered to the King [who refused to receive it on Sept. 21st][1], September 18th, 1761.

Mr Wall has declared in a paper delivered to the Earl of Bristol the 28th past, that the memorial which Mons. de Bussy presented here by order of his Court, concerning the disputes of Spain with Great Britain, was a step taken with *the full consent, approbation and pleasure of His Catholic Majesty.*

The said French memorial specifies three points of dissension, which subsist between England, and Spain.—1mo. *The restitution of prizes taken on the subjects of Spain during the present war.* 2do. *Liberty to the Spanish nation of fishing on the bank of Newfoundland.* 3tio. *The destruction of the English establishments formed on the Spanish territory in the Bay of Honduras*:—and further declares that if the Catholic King should, on account of these disputes, determine on war, His Most Christian Majesty is engaged to take part therein.

This unjust and unexampled proceeding of the Court of Spain, by enforcing her demands on England thro' the channel and by the compulsion of a hostile Power, denouncing eventually future war in conjunction, while Spain was still professing amity and friendship with Great Britain, and the full declaration and avowal, at last made by the Spanish ministry, of a total union of councils and interests between the two monarchies of the House of Bourbon, are matters of so high and urgent a nature, as call indispensably on His Majesty to take forthwith such necessary and timely measures as God has put into his hands, for the defence of the honour of his Crown and of the just and essential interests of His Majesty's people.

It is therefore most humbly submitted to His Majesty's wisdom, that orders be forthwith sent to the Earl of Bristol, to deliver a declaration signed by his Excellency to the above effect, and to return immediately to England, without taking leave.

TEMPLE, L.P.S.

Sept. 18th, 1761. W. PITT.

St James's, September 18th, 1761[2].

Mr P[itt]. Several previous steps show a fixed object and system in Spain for an union with France.

1. Memorial from Saragossa[3].
2. C[onde] de Fuentes's Memorial[4], which he avowed had been communicated to the Court of France.

[1] N. 243, f. 225. [2] H. 522, f. 304.

[3] Probably Wall's declaration of August 28 to Lord Bristol, that Bussy's memorial, concerning the Spanish grievances, was made with the full concert and approval of the King of Spain. (Below, p. 280.)

[4] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1056, on the concert between the two states and including a memorial on the restitution of prizes, and Thackeray, i. 576; but see Schaefer, ii. *b*, 387.

3. The Memorial d[elivere]d by Mon. de Bussy here, which was returned[1].
4. The intercepted letters between the Conde de Fuentes and Mr Grimaldi[2].
5. The Convention signed in August last between France and Spain[3]*.
6. The D. of Choiseul's avowal of this concert having been begun before the first opening was made by the Court of France for a negotiation of peace.

Procrastination and delay will be the most dangerous of all; tho' there is danger whichever resolution shall be taken.

A total and entire avowal of this offensive step taken by France and of an entire union of councils between France and Spain.

'Tis one House of Bourbon.

The Spanish fleet to be considered as a remaining part of the French fleet.

If difficult and dangerous now, 'twill be much more so in May next.

I incline to think that anything that is dilatory and procrastinating will increase the danger which is very great already.

Lord President [*Lord Granville*]. I would avoid two extremes:

1. Too great impatience and haste.
2. Too great delay.

Many ships of our merchants in their ports. Much English treasure on board the galleons....

Mr Pitt. What is likely to make this great danger less?

Where is the option of danger?

An immediate decision or action is most likely to extricate yourselves. Will your *means* be stronger and more practicable now? Spain has engrafted herself upon France....

[*Memorandum of the Duke of Newcastle*[4].]

October 1st, 1761.

...My Lord Hardwicke is at present of opinion to send orders to my Lord Bristol to demand an answer whether the King of Spain is under any engagements, or has any intention to take part in the war with France against Great Britain; but that my Lord Bristol should not be directed to come away but to wait for further orders.

My Lord Hardwicke thinks the report of Mr Stanley and Grimaldi's intercepted letter to Fuentes, show that Spain is more determined than before appeared.

[1] Of July 15, *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1044.

[2] Which referred to the treaty between France and Spain, signed on August 15, known as the Family Compact, and declared that the object of the Spanish Court was to gain time till the arrival of the treasure ships at Cadiz. *Chatham Corr.* ii. 139 sqq.

[3] The Family Compact. * This was an able speech. H.

[4] N. 244, f. 4.

The Duke of Newcastle has the misfortune to differ with my Lord Hardwicke upon both these points....

[The Duke was] confirmed in his opinion...that it would be improper to require at present any further explanation from Spain, ...[Wall's reply having been] "that the Court of Spain always means to live in friendship with the King[1]."

At this crisis of affairs the enforced absence (owing to a great domestic bereavement) from the consultations of the Cabinet of Lord Hardwicke, whose influence had often in similar conjunctures succeeded in inducing counsels of moderation and compromise and in composing dissensions, and who had remained the whole summer in London attending the meetings assiduously, was a most unfortunate event. On September 16, he wrote to the Duke of Newcastle in the deepest anxiety and distress, explaining the impossibility of leaving his wife's sick-bed. "God grant it may end well." It ended with her death on September 19[2]. The shock and bitterness of the loss, which entirely filled his thoughts, made attention to political business almost impossible for some time. He applied himself to the Duke of Newcastle's despatches as far as he was able, but it was not till September 30 that his spirits had sufficiently returned to enable him to receive from him a visit[3].

Meanwhile, in the Cabinet Council held on September 21, the majority, with the King's approval, had decided against Pitt to postpone action till the receipt of further despatches from Stanley at Paris. That of September 15 had been found still to give hopes of preventing the rupture of negotiations with France, and consequently making the policy of declaring war upon Spain appear still more imprudent, but Stanley's next letters and explanations and his own arrival in England finally removed all favourable impressions[4].

On October 2 assembled the Cabinet at which the momentous resolution was to be taken for peace or war with Spain.

St James October 2nd 1761. *Notes at a Meeting of the Lords.* [*Lord Hardwicke's account*[5].]

Grimaldi's letter to Fuentes dat[ed] 13th Sept. 1761[6] intercepted and the translation read.

Lord President. 1. Whether the Memorial of Mr Wall, together with the intercepted letters, are a sufficient foundation for your

[1] H. 73, f. 108.
[2] See vol. ii. 581.
[3] See pp. 324 sqq.; N. 243, ff. 197, 207, 251.
[4] N. 244, f. 1; H. 73, f. 102.
[5] H. 522, f. 310.
[6] Printed in *Chatham Corr.* ii. 141.

Lordships to form a fixed opinion that Spain means to make war against England and to warrant you to make war or come to an open rupture with them?

I would be behindhand in nothing but in the actual striking the blow. Grimaldi says France is willing to give up everything of their own, but still to be faithful to their allies. But begs that Spain may not be mentioned in the Memorial.

Popular in the City of London by reason of prizes to be got.

2. Consider your strength.

Of opinion not to give any answer to Spain.

What hostilities can you begin with advantage?

Duke of Newcastle. The interest of the Court of France to sound high the intentions of Spain to come to a rupture with England.

Earl of Bute. Mr Stanley only told me that it was very much the opinion in France that Spain would begin a war against England.

Lord Ligonier. By the last accounts, Spain has very near 60,000 foot and about from 10 or 15,000 horse.

Whether it is now prudent to throw that force into the scale of France?

The Spanish troops are not to be despised. They are valorous, orderly and well-disciplined.

Against declaring or making war.

Mr Pitt. Remain more and more convinced of the same opinion I formerly gave.

The grounds—the King's dignity—the interest of this Kingdom. Have in my bag so much matter as I think would be criminal matter against any Secretary of State, who lets it sleep in his office*.

The highest indignity that ever was offered to the Crown of England.

As to the safety of the public, 'tis the worst species of war to abet France with her full weight. Cover her trade and lend her money and abet France in negotiation.

You are now at war with the House of Bourbon.

You are prepared and she is not.

Concludes—I will be *responsible* for nothing that I do not direct†.

Lord P[*rivy*] *Seal* [Lord Temple]. It is a great satisfaction to me at the time that I am to take my leave of so many noble Lords, for whom I have the greatest respect, that I do it with such sincere conviction. Wishes your Lordships may not repent that in such a critical situation, you give the King no opinion at all.

* Probably meant the Family Compact. H. [See below, p. 280 and above, 275 *n.*; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 404 sqq. There is no foundation whatever for the strange notion that Pitt had intelligence which he concealed from the Cabinet (see Walpole's *George III*, i. 97 and *note*).]

† Surely the most insolent declaration ever made by Minister. H.

[*Minutes of the Meeting of the Council. Duke of Newcastle's account*[1].]

St James's, *October 2nd*, 1761.

Present:

Lord President	Earl of Hardwicke
Lord Privy Seal	Lord Ligonier
Duke of Devonshire	Lord Anson
Duke of Newcastle	Lord Mansfield
Earl of Bute	Mr Secretary Pitt.

...Mr Pitt adhered to the opinion, delivered in writing to the King, by my Lord Privy Seal and himself, which opinion, Mr Pitt said, was greatly confirmed and strengthened by an intercepted letter from Grimaldi at Paris, dated the 13th of August, to Mon. Fuentes here. [The Lords present adhered to their former opinions, all contrary to that of Pitt and Lord Temple.]

My Lord Hardwicke entered fully in justification of his former opinion, and to prove that no new incidents had happened, and particularly that the intercepted letter above mentioned had not altered his former opinion; that he doubted much whether Spain would declare war against us, and that it had been constantly the view of France to encourage Spain to take such steps as, knowing our vivacity, might animate us to begin with them; and that, if we should do so, we should fall into the trap laid for us, and mentioned a letter from Sir Benjamin Keene in 1754, shewing that that was then the view of France....

Mr Pitt in his speech recapitulated his own situation called (as he was without having ever asked any one single employment in his life) by his Sovereign, and he might say in some degree by the voice of the People, to assist the State, when others had *abdicated* the service of it; that he accordingly came, had gone thro' more difficulties than ever man did: that (tho' he supposed it might be good fortune) he had succeeded in his measures taken for the honour and interest of the nation; that in the execution of these measures, he had met with great obstructions from some (hinting at principal persons) who did not wish the success of them; that there was hardly one expedition which he had proposed, tho' the most probable and at last attended with the best success, that had not been before treated as chimerical and ridiculous; that he was loaded with the imputation of this war being *solely his*; that it was called *his war*; that it had been a successful one, and more than hinted that the success was singly owing to him; that the case was otherwise now; he saw what little credit he had in the Council from an union of opinion of some of the greatest persons in this Kingdom; he knew the little interest he had, either in Council or Parliament; that he had but one Lord in Council who agreed with him, with whom he would live and die[2]; that the papers he had in his bag (meaning my Lord Bristol's letter and Mr Wall's paper)

[1] N. 244, ff. 18, 43.

[2] This was very far from being the case.

fixed an eternal stain on the Crown of England, if proper measures were not taken upon it; that it would be criminal in him, as Secretary of State, to let this affair sleep in his office; that it was the greatest indignity that ever had been offered to the Crown of Great Britain. Spain is now carrying on the worst species of war she can for France, covers her trade, lends her money and abets her in negotiation; this puts you actually in war with the whole House of Bourbon; that he could not acquiesce in sending no answer to Spain; that he could agree to no answer, but what was contained in his paper; that in his station and situation he was responsible and would not continue without having the direction; that this being his case, nobody could be surprised that he could go on no longer, and he would repeat it again, that he would be responsible for nothing but what he directed; that he saw with pleasure such an union and such a conjunction of the greatest and most considerable men in this Kingdom, as he hoped would carry on the King's business with success.

My Lord President made a speech of compliment to Mr Pitt[1]... to which Mr Pitt replied owning his great obligations to my Lord President....He must also acknowledge he had great support, in particular instances, from other Lords of the old administration[2], and had always received great civilities from all.

[All the Lords, except the retiring ministers, urged the sending of strong reinforcements to Admiral Saunders in the Mediterranean forthwith.]

With these last dignified words of farewell the great minister, whose splendid national services outshine his mistakes of policy and almost obliterate his undoubted defects of character, retired from the scene and brought to a close his memorable tenure of office. He resigned the Seals into the King's hands on October 5 and was followed by Lord Temple on October 9. His conduct now was strangely different from that observed on those former occasions on which he had left the late King's service. He now took care to do nothing which might prevent his return at the conclusion of the war, and accepted from the King a pension of £3000 with a peerage for his wife, an act which brought upon him some odious but unmerited reflections, and which took the public and his followers completely by surprise, but which was no matter of astonishment to Lord Bute[3].

[1] There is no mention here of the speech ascribed to Lord Granville by Burke in the *Annual Register*, iv. [44].

[2] "Seeming by that particularly to except Lord B[ute]," Jenkinson to G. Grenville. *Grenville Papers*, i. 391.

[3] Cf. Bute to N., March 10, 1761, "that he knew Mr Pitt would never go into opposition, but in all events would retire with some honourable provision." N. 235, f. 68. See below, pp. 328–9; Walpole's *George III*, i. 64; *Letters*, v. 132; N. 244, ff. 74,

Immediately after his resignation he visited Lord Hardwicke, and in a friendly conversation, on October 13, disclaimed all intentions of opposing the measures of the government, provided he were not himself personally attacked. "He talks with much temper and moderation," wrote Lord Hardwicke to Lord Lyttelton. "I hope that temper will be preserved, and am persuaded that when he accepted these graces from the King, it was his intention[1]." A letter written to Sir James Hodges, one of his City supporters, in his well-known arrogant style, and a triumphal entry into the city, accompanied by Lord Temple, which had been organised by Alderman Beckford, on the occasion of the Guildhall banquet on November 9, when he drew to himself the applause which would have been more properly given to the King, who attended the ceremony, and when a dangerous tumult was raised against Lord Bute[2], seemed to belie at first Pitt's disclaimers. But this proved to be only a temporary intoxication, and his subsequent conduct was marked by great reserve and dignity.

Pitt's resignation of office at this juncture cannot be approved. No doubt, supposing the negotiation for peace had been carried on by the French from the first, merely as a blind, to conceal a new alliance of aggression against England, and Spain were merely waiting for the favourable moment to attack, ordinary prudence and common sense dictated an anticipation of such hostile projects and an immediate declaration of war against Spain before the coalition or the joint preparations could be completed, before the expected Spanish galleons could arrive at Cadiz, before any defence could be organized for the Spanish Colonies, and while the British forces, maintained at full strength in every part of the world and in the full flush of success, were ready to strike at any point in the dominions of the enemy.

But, as we have seen, originally, there had been no element of insincerity in the French negotiations for peace. In 1760, they had been broken up by Pitt entirely on the question of the inclusion

135, 141, 143; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 740; *Annual Reg.* iv. [44]. "By which means," wrote Mary Pitt, his sister, "he is left still at liberty to become an alderman." E. Montague, *Life and Corr.*, by E. J. Climenson, ii. 265, and see above, p. 18. Anne, another of Pitt's sisters, who had shortly before obtained a pension, and to whom he had expressed his disapproval and grief at seeing the name of Pitt in the list, "on his accepting one...copied his own letter, turning it against himself." Walpole's *George III*, i. 66.

[1] Phillimore, *Mem. of Lyttelton*, 630; below, p. 330; Chatham MSS. 39, H. to Pitt, October 12, 1761.

[2] Walpole's *George III*, i. 70, 74; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 165–6; *Grenville Papers*, i. 415; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1114; Almon, *Anecdotes of Chatham*, iii. 218.

of the King of Prussia. But this very point was made a condition of agreement, a *sine qua non*, in those held next year[1]. It was only after the rupture of the negotiations in 1760 that serious communications were resumed between France and Spain. In 1761, Choiseul began them with England once more with an earnest desire to obtain peace. "The case is that France having resolved for peace," wrote Grimaldi from Paris to Fuentes, on February 26, 1761, in an intercepted letter, "in order to prevent greater misfortunes, is ready to offer it and accept of it *in statu quo*[2]." Stanley wrote in the same terms to Pitt on July 14: "I am convinced that France seriously desires a peace with Great Britain, and that from the necessity of her affairs she prefers this measure to all further attempts upon the Continent, notwithstanding the offers of Austria and the suggestions of Spain[3]." Choiseul exerted his utmost resources to obtain peace till the arrival of Pitt's despatch of June 26 when, for the second time, Pitt caused the failure of the negotiations by insisting on demands, this time on the subject of the Fisheries, which he withdrew subsequently. It was then, however, too late. The Compact had been made between the two Bourbon States, and Choiseul had abandoned all hopes from England.

In 1760, as we have already seen, the understanding between France and Spain lost strength during the conference at the Hague, and as long as there remained hopes of peace between France and England; and revived once more as that prospect receded, and when Pitt broke off the negotiations[4]. In the same manner now, the Compact between France and Spain was not the cause, as is commonly supposed, but rather the consequence of the breakdown of the negotiation with England; and Choiseul's instructions to Bussy especially emphasized the subordination of the Compact to the attainment of an immediate peace[5].

Moreover, in the negotiations between France and Spain, the tone throughout is one of mutual defence, against what had come to be regarded as a common peril, rather than that of aggression. The inclusion of the Spanish demands in the French terms of peace was intended to show Pitt that France could have new allies, and was not compelled to accept conditions of absolute surrender.

[1] Above, pp. 145 sqq. and 268.

[2] *Chatham Corr.* ii. 91.

[3] Thackeray's *Chatham*, i. 542, ii. 544; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 335 sqq., 354; Ruville's *Pitt*, ii. 360, 363 sqq., 375 sqq.; Arneth, *Maria Theresia*, vi. 193 sqq., 262 sqq.; R. H. Soltau, *The Duke de Choiseul*, pp. 60–75.

[4] Above, pp. 150 sqq.

[5] *Revue Hist.* lxxi. p. 6, already quoted.

On her side, Spain was anxious not to be left isolated and exposed to England's power. Even the terms of the Compact, a revival of the treaties of 1733 and 1743 between the two countries, connected by the closest ties of blood and policy[1], did not necessarily constitute any act of aggressive defiance of England. Spain was only to declare war against England in case no peace had been reached by May 1, 1762; and the original object of the treaty was not to renew the war, but by a demonstration of strength and solidarity to hasten on and conclude the peace. In the same letter of July 7 to Ossun, the French Ambassador at Madrid, in which Choiseul refers with satisfaction to the Compact, he adds: "Vous ne cacherez pas au Roi d'Espagne que nous avons besoin de la paix dans ce moment, et que nous comptons que les engagements que nous prenons n'éloigneront pas cette paix nécessaire[2]." In an intercepted letter of August 17, Wall repudiates to Fuentes all hostile intentions[3]. When, however, in consequence of Pitt's attitude, peace was seen to be hopeless, the alliance naturally assumed an offensive character, aiming at an early combined attack upon England[4].

The attack upon Belleisle also, at the very time that the negotiations for peace were in progress and had reached a hopeful stage, the conquest of which on July 7 came at the most critical moment, was in all probability a serious tactical error, if peace were really intended. "So little was [the Congress of Augsburg] to the inclination of Mr Pitt," writes Walpole, "that he prosecuted with unusual warmth an expedition he had meditated against Belleisle, a conquest of so little value and so inadequate to the expense, with which it was attended, that the plan was by many believed calculated solely to provoke the Court of France and break off the negotiation[5]." In any case it was a step, as the Duke of Newcastle pointed out, only too likely to hasten the maritime union between France and Spain[6].

[1] *Eng. Hist. Rev.* i. 86 sqq.

[2] Bourguet, *Le Duc de Choiseul*, 222.

[3] *Chatham Corr.* ii. 137.

[4] Sir J. Yorke, nevertheless, writes as late as October 6: "Neither ministers' nor merchants' accounts represent the Spaniards as having taken any serious measures as should denote a rupture with England." N. 244, f. 78.

[5] *George III*, i. 43; cf. Schaefer, ii. *b*, 329, 341, 344, who dates from this event the change for the worse in the tone of the negotiations. Also Fox, in *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 43; Frederick, who had welcomed it on April 20, 1761, as an excellent measure, "pour presser d'autant mieux la France à la conclusion de la paix," later, *e.g.* June 25, urges unceasingly the necessity for a suspension of arms, without which the negotiations would be without result. *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xx. 348, 487, but cf. 495, 568.

[6] H. 72, f. 279.

The tone of triumph and mastery adopted by Pitt towards an enemy, defeated, and as he thought vanquished and humiliated, was one extremely imprudent in the circumstances and only too likely to justify and increase the fears, already felt, of English domination. The manner and character of his despatches had untoward consequences and met with general disapproval. It was in the same tone that he had replied to Bussy in June, who had made representations on the subject of the British captures from the French before the declaration of hostilities. The cannon had decided the point in favour of England, Pitt declared, and he regarded this decision as an award, provoking the excellent retort from Choiseul that the cannon indeed decided, but only the last[1]. "He has a good deal of pride," wrote Jenkinson to George Grenville, June 18, 1761, "and it is evident Mr Pitt has not known how to treat that[2]." Language was used by Pitt which deeply offended the French King, and which drew from Stanley, Pitt's own subordinate, earnest remonstrances. "The French are to be treated with great firmness and dignity," he wrote, "but now that his Majesty's honour has been so nobly asserted and that these most improper intrusions into his affairs are so fully repelled, I submit it to you whether it might not be expedient to soften that asperity which might before be necessary. My reason for this intimation is that I know the King of France has been grieved, not to say personally offended, at some particular expressions, and has said with great warmth 'that he was ready to resign provinces for the peace but that he would not be deprived of his honour and of the character of a man of truth and probity[3].'" Sir Joseph Yorke wished there had been "a little more sugar" in the great man's methods, "mais le Seigneur Jupiter ne sait pas dorer la pilule, which is a fault in negotiating, especially when you are of the winning side[4]."

The insulting and triumphant tone adopted by Pitt, induced by the pride of power and consciousness of success, was both unnecessary and unworthy of the victor in the great struggle. He made the fatal mistake of underrating and ignoring the moral strength of our former great hereditary enemy, and of imagining, because her physical resources were for the moment expended and exhausted, that the national spirit was also broken and extinguished. That spirit is often lowered by success and prosperity and greatly

[1] *Revue Hist.* lxxi. p. 9; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 344.
[2] *Grenville Papers*, i. 368.
[3] Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 603.
[4] Add. 6836, f. 149.

raised and stimulated by disaster and adversity, and it now proved sufficient to reject the terms of absolute surrender. Pitt, after bringing France to her knees, had set her on her feet again. "After Mr Pitt was out," writes the second Lord Hardwicke, "Mr Stanley did say clearly and to myself that he thought his manner of negotiating spoilt the peace, and that France, though humbled and weakened, was still a *Power* which had an existence in the world[1]."

It seems clear that the chief responsibility for the lamentable break-down of the administration at the moment of final victory, when the time had come to crown the great war triumphs by a great peace, must be placed on Pitt's shoulders. He had declared that "no peace of Utrecht should again stain the annals of England"; but his whole conduct had been such as to render a like issue probable, and indeed inevitable. He showed the same arbitrary and violent spirit, used the same methods and insisted in the same way on excessive demands from the defeated foe—waiting, according to Lord Hardwicke's phrase, "for the highest throw of the dice,"—as those who had wrecked the negotiations of 1711 and stirred up Louis XIV and the starving French nation to make one more effort against England; and if the same mischievous consequences followed now from the retirement of Pitt as followed then from the dismissal of the Whigs, it was chiefly owing to Pitt's misuse of his opportunities for securing a favourable peace. "Je ne puis même vous dissimuler," wrote Frederick to Knyphausen in April 1761, on seeing the little zeal which Pitt showed in the work of peace, "que je commence d'avoir une petite idée du Sieur Pitt."—"Si donc, les ministres Anglais ne marqueront pas bientôt plus d'empressement que jusqu'à présent...," he writes in May: "je suis bien assuré qu'ils le regretteront à la suite, mais trop tard et quand le mal ne sera plus à remédier[2]." "I agree with you," writes Jenkinson, who still believed in Pitt's real desire for peace, to George Grenville, on August 4, "that their [the French] manner of negotiating the peace has been more able than their manner of conducting the war. I wish the reverse of this character may not belong to us[3]."

The strange contrast between the ability shown by Pitt in organising and carrying on the war and the complete incapacity to conclude it strikes the student of these events at once as

[1] H. 73, f. 102.

[2] *Pol. Corr.* xx. 339, 398; also 359, 370.

[3] *Grenville Papers*, i. 381–2.

surprising and mysterious. There can scarcely be any doubt that Pitt had no more real desire for peace in 1761 than he had in 1759 or 1760, and that his misuse of opportunity was deliberate, not the result of a series of diplomatic blunders which it is difficult to ascribe to a person of Pitt's transcendent abilities and foresight, but of a settled determination to continue the war and even to greatly extend its scope.

The complete accomplishment of the objects with which the war had been undertaken by England was not sufficient, but the power of France was to be blotted out, not only in the New World but in the Old. Then the victorious arms of Britain were to be turned against Spain. Pitt "despised" that country, and "flung out that we shall be better able, by our captures, to carry on the war with Spain against us than without it[1]." The colonies of Spain in the New World might then meet the same fate as those of France, and Mexico and Peru as well as Havannah and Manilla be added with Canada to the British empire.

With vast ideas of war and conquest of this kind were no doubt mixed personal and party motives, as they had been in the war of Queen Anne. Pitt had often on former occasions, as we have seen, subordinated his political opinions to the exigencies of his personal situation; and it is almost impossible to resist the conviction that his conduct was now once more guided in some degree by similar considerations. His power and popularity rested on the triumphs and conquests he had achieved in war and would be endangered, and perhaps destroyed, in the less brilliant office of maker of the peace, which, in view especially of the disadvantageous position of the allies in Germany, must include some compromises, concessions and disappointments. The King of Prussia on being applied to by Pitt, showed no disposition to facilitate the course of negotiations, and rejected with surprise and indignation the suggestion that he should forward the cause of peace by some concessions on his side[2]. A peace, "however good," writes Walpole, "would have given a shock to Mr Pitt's credit from the impossibility of contenting all mankind[3]."

As the time for the opening of the negotiations and the moment for decision approached, in April 1761, Pitt, overwhelmed with the difficulties presented and the impossibility of satisfying all parties, especially his own supporters, suddenly abandoned his former reasonable view and showed himself quite altered in his attitude

[1] N. 241, f. 281. [2] *Chatham Corr.* ii. 107. [3] *George III*, i. 33 and 26.

towards peace[1]. He expressed a general disapproval of any attempt to conclude the war at that moment, declared that he would rather lose the use of his right hand than sign a treaty leaving the Newfoundland Fisheries to France, and demanded that Bussy, on his arrival, should be at once furnished with an ultimatum of the British terms from which no departure whatever should be considered, adding significantly, "that there were heads enough able to make and support a peace without him." On the occasion of a Cabinet Council in the middle of May the great question was debated, whether the whole of the newly acquired possessions should be kept and the allies left to the Congress, or whether the principle of compensation for the losses of the latter should be admitted in the negotiations; in other words whether the King of Prussia was to be abandoned or the British conquests "mouldered away." Pitt arrogantly demanded the opinion of each member of the Council, positively refusing to give his own, declaring himself indifferent, and affecting merely "to take orders." "It is intolerable," wrote Lord Hardwicke, "in Mr Pitt to mix so much reflexion and acrimony in his harangues." Lord Hardwicke did not scruple in private to the Duke of Newcastle to declare his opinion that peace could not be made with honour without compensating the King's continental allies, and agreed with the Duke of Bedford that "it is possible for England to be overloaded with foreign colonies," that is, colonies already inhabited by foreigners. But the Duke of Newcastle was too old and experienced a politician to be drawn into the trap, to be impaled on the horns of a dilemma and held up to popular obloquy whichever course he advocated. A decision, however, on this question, as the Duke of Bedford pointed out, was inevitable sooner or later, and it was one which Pitt determined should be made by others and not by himself[2]. "Your Lordship may remember some months ago," wrote Bubb Dodington to Lord Bute, on October 8, "I said I thought Mr Pitt would never make a peace, because he could never make such a peace as he had taught the nation to expect. I suppose he now sees that we are within a year or two of an impracticability of carrying on the war upon the present footing, and may think upon going out upon a spirited pretence to turn the attention and dissatisfaction of the public on [others]..."[3]. "I am not much surprised," wrote Soame

[1] Cf. his conference with N. in December 1760, below, p. 314.
[2] Below, pp. 315–7; N. 238, ff. 63, 123; H. 72, f. 274.
[3] Adolphus, *Hist. of England*, i. 573.

Jenyns to Lord Royston, "at the intended resignation, because I was always satisfied that sooner or later it must happen. Your Lordship must remember that I have often said Mr Pitt never would, or could, agree to any peace; but that he must push things so desperately that no one could follow him, and then make that an excuse for quitting...and I am certain that it is not in his power to act now on any other plan[1]." "Now what can be Pitt's meaning," writes Fox, no unbiassed critic of his great rival, indeed, but who here does no more than express forcibly the general well-informed opinion, "or what can it be resolved into but a desire that a peace may be made without him, which he may say had been better, if he might have had his way[2]?"

The difference of opinion in the Cabinet, which was not on the question whether war should be declared upon Spain, but whether it should be declared at that very moment, though undoubtedly of importance, did not appear sufficient to justify in itself so serious a measure as Pitt's immediate retirement. To Sir Joseph Yorke "the avowed motives for the resignation" did not "seem quite agreeable to sound policy[3]," and the Prussian envoys informed Frederick that, joined to regret at his loss and admiration for his talents, was a condemnation of the pretext put forward and of the occasion chosen for the momentous step[4].

At the same time, while quitting office, Pitt took care to leave the door open behind him, through which he could return when the problem of the peace had been solved and settled[5].

Whether the motives or the cause of Pitt's public conduct were such as have been here suggested or not, there is no doubt that he was generally credited with a desire to prolong the war and obstruct the peace[6]. Thus the chief and essential condition of success in the negotiations was absent. There was no confidence of one party in the other's sincerity in the work of peace, and this had clearly a direct and most mischievous influence on the result.

[1] Rockingham, *Mem.* i. 47.

[2] *Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 43–6. See also Bute's opinion, expressed as early as January 2, 1761, Dodington's *Diary*, 377, and Lord J. Cavendish to the D. of Grafton to the same effect, Grafton's *Autobiography*, 35; and Lord G. Sackville's *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Mrs Stopford-Sackville, i. 85; and Ruville, iii. 26.

[3] Add. 6836, f. 149. [4] Schaefer, ii. *b*, 739. [5] Above, p. 280.

[6] Below, p. 337; A. Bourguet's *Études sur la Politique Étrangère de Choiseul*, 200; also Choiseul's *Memoir*, though a suspicious testimony, may perhaps be added, printed in Soulange-Bodin, *Le Pacte de Famille*, 243; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 119. Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 526. Pitt's assurances to the contrary would have very little effect. *Grenville Papers*, i. 380, 386.

In the same way suspicion, if not conviction, of Pitt's intentions and motives, created distrust between Pitt and his fellow ministers, and precluded that close union and co-operation necessary for carrying through the great work. Lord Hardwicke, and with him the Duke of Newcastle and the Whig Lords, while giving Pitt all their support, had long had misgivings concerning the issue and tendency of his policy and measures. The opportunity afforded by the victories of 1759 had at least not been used by Pitt to the best advantage in the interests of peace. Another year had passed, and yet another was passing, in which the finest opportunities of making peace were suffered to escape with the prospect only of an interminable continuance of the war and of its extension to include fresh enemies. The war expenditure rose higher in each successive year. The supply demanded for 1761 amounted to nearly 20 millions and the national debt, which in 1755 had been 72 millions, had now been increased to 102 millions. There were signs that the supply of recruits was beginning to fail[1]. To make the comparison of the political situation with that in Queen Anne's reign still more complete, circumstances had greatly changed since the beginning of the war, and its continuance now, as far as British interests were concerned, could not be justified on the same grounds as its commencement.

The dangerous predominance of France had been destroyed, and to weaken France further would be to upset the balance of power in Europe, which had long been the cardinal point of England's security. To drive Spain and France into a league against England might not only prolong the present war but have much more extended consequences. The objects with which England had entered into the war were for the most part attained. To prosecute the war further was to employ the resources of Britain in deciding whether Austria or Prussia should dominate in Germany, and to follow the fatal error of France, by which she had been undone. The alliance with Prussia was no longer a support, but a burden. Since the French had lost their colonies, the German war had ceased to be a "diversion," which had been its chief justification hitherto. It became now the principal scene of hostilities, one where Great Britain could never hope to be superior, and where the results were the least proportionate to the expenditure. This was, indeed, to pursue the old Hanoverian policy with

[1] Ruville, ii. 331.

all its attendant disadvantages. "Hard is the fate of Britain," it was declared, "when we see men force themselves into power by disclaiming for 20 years together against a particular part of Germany; and then making use of that power to sacrifice three times the sum in one year which others had done in the course of 20, to an impossible defence of it[1]."

After several years of doubt and misgiving, Lord Hardwicke was now convinced that no peace would ever be obtained while Pitt controlled the negotiations. He had supported the prolongation of the war with France, inevitable in the circumstances. The extension of the war to include Spain was a different matter. He could not share Pitt's contempt of Spain or agree that the addition of a new antagonist, with its treasure and its navy and its army, added to those of France, would be an advantage to England. He feared that England might have to face a hostile combination of France, Austria, Russia and Spain. To these, hesitating neutrals, such as Holland and Denmark, who had already showed signs of making common cause with Spain, might possibly be added. He reminded the Council that it had long been the desire of France to incite Spain into taking steps which would bring on war with England. He doubted, as Pitt himself seems to have done, the moment he quitted office; thought there were not sufficient proofs to justify the driving Spain permanently into the arms of France with all the further obstacles to peace which this must entail, and wished to exhaust every means and to postpone hostilities till the intentions of Spain had more fully declared themselves. Delay might indeed breed new dissensions between the two states and itself nullify any fruits of the alliance[2].

Such were the substantial grounds of Lord Hardwicke's opposition and of the rest of the Lords to Pitt at this crisis. Nevertheless, if one can venture to judge in so complicated a situation, though right in principle, in the actual circumstances, which were not so completely known to them as they are to ourselves, it was probably unwise and mistaken. It came too late. All prospect of peace with France had, as we have seen, been destroyed by Pitt by

[1] See the very able pamphlet entitled *Considerations on the Present German War*, by Israel Mauduit, 1760, said by Walpole to have been published under Lord Hardwicke's patronage and the materials to have been "furnished by the faction of the Yorkes" (*George III*, i. 25; *Letters*, v. 7), which made a great impression and went rapidly through a number of editions; and *Occasional Thoughts on the Present German War*, by the same writer; also the reply, *A Fair and Complete Answer*.

[2] Below, pp. 327–8, 331; N. 244, f. 143; N. 241, f. 310.

July. The negotiations were from that time only artificially prolonged; and the continuation of the war, and with it the French compact with Spain, became from that time inevitable. It would have been wiser, if such a step had been possible, to have effectively opposed Pitt's conduct of the negotiations at an earlier stage, when they still offered hopes of success, rather than to interfere now in his preparations for war[1]. To be the first to attack always carries with it extraordinary advantages, and it was a bold stroke of this kind which had gained for Frederick his victories at the beginning of the hostilities in Germany and enabled him to hold out so long afterwards against overwhelming adversaries. The prospect too of attacking Spain in her American Colonies was very favourable at this moment.

Moreover, Pitt's retirement, as the issue proved, did not leave the control of the negotiations in the hands of the Whigs, whose power began to dissolve from this moment. They had in fact only exchanged a war at any cost for a peace at any price. The extensive, even if imprudent, schemes of Pitt were thrown into a noble relief by the petty and narrow views of Bute and his adherents; and his war policy was apparently justified by subsequent events, when the peace party, having obtained the ascendant, found themselves, but now in conditions less favourable than before, unable after all to avoid hostilities and finally signed an inadequate peace.

Lord Chesterfield's congratulations to the Duke of Newcastle on the "elopement of his termagant wife," were scarcely justified. Lord Bute's ascendancy was from the moment of Pitt's retirement established, and the expulsion of the rest of the Whigs was only a question of time and convenience. The Duke of Newcastle, on whose support Bute had, a few months ago, in different circumstances, placed so high a value, was now only a "crazy old man," whose power was quite gone and who was to be kept on a year or two only on sufferance[2]. Lord Bute now "found things could not go on between them." He "early began to make ground for himself," writes the second Lord Hardwicke, "and several pamphlets published at that time from quarters friendly to him, threw ridicule

[1] Cf. Sir J. Yorke, October 6, 1761: "I have long felt that Mr Pitt's overbearing way would in the end force a rupture,...but it is a pity they did not unite in the beginning of the negotiation and carry things through with courage and temper; for except himself, everybody at the bottom was of one mind about the Peace." H. 17, f. 359.

[2] *Grenville Papers*, i. 395; below, p. 331.

on the Duke of Newcastle. His Grace and my Father both should have had their conduct better defended."[1]

Meanwhile, the Duke of Newcastle was allowed to keep his place a few months longer, till the plans of Bute and the Court were further matured. After considerable delay and unwillingness[2] "Lord Bute, by his Majesty's command," writes Lord Hardwicke, on November 16, 1761, in his memorandum, "offered me the Privy Seal (lately resigned by Lord Temple) in the presence of the Duke of Newcastle; but I declined it with great duty to the King and strong professions of zeal for his service, wishing it might be disposed of in such manner as might best promote that service in this difficult and critical conjuncture. This his Majesty was pleased to acknowledge to me the same day in his Closet as a very disinterested instance of my zeal for his service, and to enlarge much on his esteem for me and his protection and favour to me and my family. The Privy Seal was given to the Duke of Bedford[3]." Lord Egremont, brother-in-law to George Grenville, became Secretary in the place of Pitt. To Grenville, who still kept his place as Treasurer of the Navy and abandoned his connection with Pitt and with his brother Lord Temple, was assigned a place in the Cabinet and the leadership of the House of Commons, an appointment which Lord Hardwicke characterised as "what Gil Blas did when he could do no better," but an office in which he was chiefly employed by Lord Bute in "working the Duke of Newcastle out of the Treasury[4]." Bute further sought to strengthen himself by an alliance with Fox, who, at the price of the long-coveted peerage for his wife, and on the condition that he should hold his tongue, abstain from interference with Grenville's leadership and act entirely according to Bute's directions, "when, what and where," placed himself entirely at the Favourite's disposal[5].

[1] H. 73, f. 127. In January 1762, the *Remembrancer* published an abusive article against Lord Hardwicke and his family. H. 249, f. 7.

[2] Below, p. 331.

[3] H. 900, f. 1. The delay in offering it probably influenced his decision. Writing on October 12 to his eldest son on the false report of his appointment, he declares himself uncertain as to accepting it. H. 4, f. 197. Cf. Lady Hervey, October 21 (*Letters to E. Morris*, 283), "What I least of all comprehend is the Privy Seal's being put into commission, when it is well known that Lord Hardwicke has long sighed for it in lieu of the dirty pension which, with all his immense riches, he took and now enjoys." Then follows a fatuous note from the editor on Lord H.'s "fondness for money." It will be remembered that Lord H. accepted no pension. Above, vol. ii. 280.

[4] Below, p. 329, and note by the second Lord Hardwicke, H. 73, f. 101.

[5] See the Corr. in Lord Shelburne's *Life*, i. 100–117; and below, p. 336; H. 73, ff. 133–5; N. 244, f. 279.

Charles Yorke became shortly afterwards Attorney-General in the room of Pratt, who was now appointed Chief-Justice of the Common Pleas[1].

On the reconstruction of the ministry, Lord Hardwicke forwarded to the Duke of Newcastle a memorandum of such measures as ought to engage immediately his care and attention. These included: The choice of a proper successor to Pitt, to find out his plans, "to talk high for carrying on the war but not for extending it;...to keep constantly in view and to endeavour above all things to bring about a good peace; to secure the money for next year's supplies as soon as possible...to consider and be vigilant to every part of this extensive war; to consider particularly what expeditions or operations of Great Britain are depending,—what orders have been given about the expedition at Martinico and to General Amherst, what remain to be given, what additional force ought to be sent—to neglect nothing to secure our conquests...manning the fleet and putting the ships into good condition; to recruit and reinforce the army, consider of methods to get men; the militia; it cannot be actually dropped now during the war[2]."

But the Duke of Newcastle was no longer in a position to follow Lord Hardwicke's counsels. It soon became evident that there was no intention of leaving him any power in the Cabinet. Measures of the greatest public importance were settled between Bute, Lord Egremont and George Grenville without his approval or knowledge. The promise of 6000 men to Portugal was made without once consulting him[3]. Lord Bute conducted the negotiations with France independently and privately through his brother, James Mackenzie, and Count Viry and the Bailli de Solar, Sardinian ministers respectively in London and Paris, the last of whom communicated with Choiseul[4]. War was declared against Spain,—an event which naturally afforded a great triumph to Pitt and his followers[5],—greatly to his disappointment, and the previous negotiations were carried on without his concurrence or approval[6].

Lord Bristol's despatch, of October 14, 1761, had contained favourable assurances from the Spanish Court, and there seemed still hope, in view of the resumed negotiations with France, of

[1] For the signification of these appointments see below, pp. 364–7.
[2] H. 72, f. 272. The five years term for the militia ended on May 1, 1762.
[3] pp. 347–8; N. 247, ff. 362, 408.
[4] *Memoirs of a Traveller now in Retirement* (Dutens), (1806), ii. 16.
[5] Walpole's *George III*, i. 101, 104.
[6] H. 73, f. 128; *Rockingham Mem.* i. 56.

avoiding hostilities[1]. On October 16, and even as late as December 11, Sir Joseph Yorke wrote that an universal disbelief in the hostile intentions of Spain prevailed abroad[2].

But Lord Bute, though pretending great unconcern, had become alarmed at the enthusiasm manifested for Pitt in the City. At a great meeting on October 22, thanks to the great war minister, and regret at his loss were voted; while at the same time its parliamentary representatives were instructed to oppose all concessions for the sake of peace and especially that of the Fisheries[3]. Bute sought to attract to himself some of Pitt's popularity, by outdoing him in warlike zeal and vigour; if not in acts, at least in words. He reproached the Duke of Newcastle for his pacific disposition and "breathed war as much as Mr Pitt did." He added to the King's Speech of November 6, prepared as usual by Lord Hardwicke, some *verba sonantia*, written by George Grenville, in Pitt's grandest manner, threatened descents upon the French coast and, taking the cue from the City, repudiated all notions of concessions on any consideration. The word peace was not to be even mentioned, either in the Speech or in the Motion for the Address. In its final form, however, these bellicose phrases were dropped, and the Speech followed the lines laid down by Lord Hardwicke, peace being made the aim and object of the whole, to gain which the energetic prosecution of the war was only the means[4].

A despatch for Spain was now prepared by Lord Egremont, which, accompanied by friendly assurances, made the communication of the clauses of the Compact which affected British interests, a *sine qua non* to further negotiations. To this the Duke of Newcastle objected as tending to destroy the present favourable inclination of Spain, and on the ground that it was wiser to come to terms, when the treaty, *ipso facto*, would dissolve, and a dangerous accession of strength to France would be prevented. Lord Hardwicke, however, though in favour of a friendly method of negotiation, thought that the demand might be made without giving offence, and seemed to enter into Lord Egremont's notion that something was due from Spain in satisfaction of the national honour.

The despatch, therefore, was forwarded on October 28, with a letter to Lord Bristol, added by Lord Hardwicke's advice, which

[1] H. 73, f. 131.
[2] N. 247, f. 119; J. Y. to Bute, R. O., S. P. Holland.
[3] N. 244, ff. 406, 442 sqq.; *Annual Register*, iv. [301].
[4] Below, pp. 335 sqq.; N. 245, f. 223; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1110.

was intended to soften its import. Before, however, this communication reached Madrid, the Spanish government in consequence, according to Bristol, of the arrival of their treasure ships, suddenly changed its friendly tone to one of hostility. On November 19, a precise answer was demanded by Great Britain which was refused by Spain on December 10, and war, which Lord Hardwicke now recognised to have been for some time inevitable, was proclaimed on January 4, 1762[1].

Preparations had long been made in anticipation of the event. Martinico was captured on February 12, an acquisition of great importance on account of the sugar trade, and according to Rodney, the key of the French West Indies[2]; while Grenada, St Lucia and St Vincent followed soon afterwards. In May, troops were despatched to the assistance of Portugal, which had been invaded by Spain; and an expedition was fitted out by Anson for the conquest of Havannah.

It soon, however, became apparent that Bute intended no active or systematic prosecution of the war. Regardless of the immense national interests involved, his one aim was to hasten on a peace, when the Whigs could be dispensed with and at the same time an administration might be secured in accordance with the King's wishes, controlled by the Crown, and independent of Parliament and of political parties, by whose support and co-operation alone a great war could be carried on.

After considerable wavering and hesitation, he took at length the momentous step of abandoning the German war and of refusing the annual subsidy to Frederick, although the money had already been promised, on conditions, to the Prussian envoys. The pursuit of popularity was doubtless a chief ingredient in this decision[3]. The neglect of Hanover, ostentatiously paraded, and the cessation of further continental expenditure, it was hoped, would raise applause. The desertion of Prussia also relieved the government from the necessity of making unpopular concessions to compensate the

[1] See below, pp. 335, 338–42; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1151–1210; Adolphus, *George III*, 52 sqq.; N. 244, ff. 144, 406, 421, 470; N. 245, ff. 57, 78, 221; N. 247, f. 401. There is no truth in Walpole's statement (*George III*, i. 102) which has misled Herr v. Ruville (*Pitt*, iii. 31) that "Lord Hardwicke when the affirmative was decided, declared he would return no more to Council." The report had been circulated in the City but without any foundation. H. 73, f. 178; N. 248, f. 171. The acquiescence of the Whig leaders in the war was very severely criticised by Lord Royston in a letter to Charles Yorke of December 27, printed in *Rock. Mem.* i. 58.

[2] p. 347; *Chesterfield's Letters* (Bradshaw), 1178.

[3] p. 333.

allies; it simplified the issues and made the attainment of a peace at any price, the great object of Bute's policy, more practicable and possible.

An imprudent, but well-intentioned, negotiation was attempted once more with Austria. Sir Joseph Yorke was instructed by Bute, on January 12, to revive through Prince Louis of Brunswick, without communicating the plan to the King of Prussia, the former Austrian jealousy of the Bourbon power, by representing the consequences to Austria of the recent Family Compact and of the threatened Spanish invasion of Portugal, and to suggest compensations for Austria at the expense of Spain in Italy, whereby the Empress might be induced, it was hoped, to leave the King of Prussia in peaceful possession of Silesia[1].

In Lord Hardwicke's opinion, such a negotiation, which made England appear to be "knocking at every door," could do nothing but harm[2]. His fears were fully realised. The project met with a curt negative from Austria, who made use of the communication only to exhibit England as reduced to her last resources, and to excite the King of Prussia's jealousy. The negotiation was represented to Frederick as an attempt to conclude the war by forced cessions on his part in Silesia, and Bute's protests and the communication of the correspondence in no way diminished Frederick's suspicions and indignation[3].

Moreover, an ill-judged private interview accorded by Bute to Prince Galitzin, the retiring Russian Ambassador in London, on February 6, deepened the bad impression already created. According to Bute's account, which is corroborated by his own despatch to the British envoys at St Petersburg, nothing passed which could be considered in any way hostile to the king of Prussia's

[1] Below, p. 347; R. O., State Papers, Holland, January 12, 19, 26, 1762; Adolphus, *George III*, i. 579 sqq. Bute had at first, apparently, endeavoured to keep "the D. of N.'s friend out of the secret." H. 17, f. 406; H. 10, f. 222.

[2] N. 251, f. 11.

[3] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxi. 343, 353–4, 403, 494; *Buckingham Corr.* i. 47, 51 sqq.; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 745, 748–9; Bute to J. Y., March 26, 1762, and J. Y. to Bute, April 2; R. O., St. Pap., Holland. According to Ruville (iii. 37) who, however, gives no authority, Prince Louis "on his own responsibility, intimated that England would have no objection to the acquisition of the whole of Silesia by the Empress Queen. Nothing to this effect is to be found in the English despatches," and such a proposal is in direct contradiction to the whole object of the overture to Austria, which was to draw her off from Silesia. Cf. N. to the D. of Bedford, April 12, 1762, "That affair had been very falsely represented and my Lord Bute, I hope, will have set it right." *Bedford Corr.* iii. 74. A part of Sir J. Y.'s correspondence of this period (H. 96) has been burnt, but the gap can be supplied from the State Papers in the Record Office.

interests, though stress was laid upon the hope that the new Czar would use his influence in persuading Frederick to put an end to the war with Austria on reasonable terms, rather than encourage him to persist in it. Prince Galitzin, however, a person devoted to the French and Austrian interests, reported that Bute's exhortations had as their object the cession of Silesian territory to Austria under Russian pressure[1].

These negotiations, though doubtless innocent and not open to the charge of perfidy generally brought against their author, show a feeble and inexperienced hand. There is, however, far more reason to censure Frederick's own conduct at this crisis, who, if he really desired to maintain the alliance with England, played his cards very ill. He declined to accept any explanations of these unfortunate transactions, though the correspondence was submitted to him. He refused to communicate his plans to the British ministers, maintaining an attitude of reserve and almost of hostility. "His Prussian Majesty," wrote Sir Joseph Yorke, his most devoted and zealous admirer and supporter, "must be more communicative, more successful or less obstinate; else it will be impossible to know what to do with him"; and to the representations which he ventured to make of the anxiety which his silence was causing in England, Frederick only replied sharply on January 14, 1762: "Ce n'est pas sur les discours frivoles de Yorke que je réglerai ma conduite[2]." Even at the lowest period of his fortunes, in the summer of 1761, during Pitt's administration, he had indignantly rejected the suggestion of making any concessions to his enemies for the sake of peace, appealing to England's former fidelity to her allies and to examples of Roman fortitude, and desiring that such proposals might never again be made to him[3]. The death of the Czarina, on January 5, 1762, now wrought a most fortunate change in Frederick's prospects and transformed Russia from a dreaded and powerful foe to an enthusiastic ally; while the murder of the new Czar later, together with the seizure of the throne by the Empress Catherine, only turned the alliance into a benevolent neutrality[4]. Peace too was soon afterwards made with Sweden.

But Frederick would not regard the changed situation from the British point of view, or consider that while the forces arrayed against

[1] Bute to J. Y., February 6, 1762, St. P., Holland; Ruville, iii. 43 sqq.; Adolphus, *George III*, i. 76 sqq., 576 sqq.

[2] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxi. 181.

[3] *Ib.* xx. 480, 483, 487, 506–7, 536, 590–1; also N. 233, f. 45.

[4] *Buckinghamshire Corr.* (R. Hist. Soc. Publications), i. 43 sqq.

him were now greatly diminished, those opposed to England had, on the contrary, by the junction of Spain with France, considerably increased, or allow that the necessity of protecting Portugal made the maintenance of the German war still more onerous and difficult. Elated by his good fortune, new hopes of conquests and victories now opened before him; while the British alliance had no longer the same value, though the subsidy was still an agreeable addition to Prussian resources and was still demanded. The long expected letter from Frederick to the King, therefore, when it at length arrived, contained no scheme of peace and nothing but enthusiasm for the war[1]. Keith, the British Ambassador at St Petersburg, who had for some time represented Prussian interests there and to whom Frederick was greatly indebted[2], was now ignored and excluded from his negotiation with the Czar Peter. The treaty with Russia, as well as that with Sweden, was made without consulting the British government or endeavouring to include England. Frederick, moreover, treacherously, and in violation of his engagements with England, offered to guarantee Holstein to the Czar in return for the guarantee of Silesia by Russia. This negotiation, kept a secret from the British ministers, was, however, discovered by them, and it confirmed the apprehensions which already existed regarding Frederick's conduct, and increased the suspicions that the British subsidy, which he did not scruple at the same time to demand, was to be employed, not in bringing the war to an end, but in continuing it and extending it[3]. A further unfortunate incident now occurred to increase Lord Bute's dislike of Frederick and of the German war. It is said that those who pry into correspondence not intended for their eye seldom derive any personal satisfaction from what they discover there. It proved so in this case; for the English ministers, on a letter from Frederick to his representatives in London of January 29, being intercepted and deciphered, found themselves described to their surprise and indignation as lunatics only fit for Bedlam. "Entre nous dit, que reste-t-il à faire autrement avec des gens qui, pour ainsi dire, font les enragés, que de les accompagner aux petites maisons[4]?" Even the Duke of Newcastle in these circumstances began to doubt the wisdom of giving the subsidy, but was kept firm by

[1] January 22, 1762, *Pol. Corr.* xxi. 194; below, pp. 342 sqq.
[2] *Mem. and Corr. of Sir Robert Keith*, i. 51.
[3] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxi. 454; Adolphus, *George III*, i. 77, 581; *Mitchell Mem.* ii. 279.
[4] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxi. 209.

Lord Hardwicke's representations[1]. Frederick had for some time been endeavouring to stir up opposition in England against the ministers. He even directed his envoys to approach Pitt and endeavour to secure his co-operation. But the suggestion was at once rejected. "His Grace [of Newcastle]," writes Lord Royston, on January 27, 1762, "showed me...a very remarkable despatch from Knyphausen to his Master in which he gives an account of a long conversation with Mr Pitt, in which the latter talked in a very lowering strain about the German war, that it is grown very burdensome and unpopular, and if the defence of Portugal should be undertaken, must for ought he knew be necessarily given up; he advises the King of P[russia] to take the subsidy as it is offered to him[2], though the mode may not be so decent and respectful towards his Majesty, and he strongly recommends it to his P[russian] Majesty, to *compound* as *well as he can* with his bad fortune, by making up with the Empress Queen[3]." Further proposals to Pitt in May for effecting Bute's downfall met with the same cold reception[4]. The Prussian envoys then carried their intrigues into the City and endeavoured to procure a petition against the retrocession of Martinique[5]. Their conduct was no secret from Bute, and on August 5, 1762, George Grenville, by the King's command, intimated to the Prussian envoys that no further communication would be held with them[6].

Such were the causes of the unfortunate separation of British and Prussian interests at this time. Lord Bute's conduct, which has been judged too much from Frederick's own interested narrative, is explained and purged of the charges of perfidy and treachery. At the same time, it can by no means be justified. The advantage of treating with the enemy and of concluding the war, united with, and at the head of, the allies, transcended almost all other considerations. At this moment, moreover, on May 1, the renewal of the negotiations with France seemed to promise success, and the Cabinet had unanimously agreed to concede the small island of Miquelon as well as St Pierre, and to give up Martinique

[1] Below, pp. 344–6.

[2] *I.e.* with the modification of Art. IV of the Treaty. See below.

[3] H. 4, f. 224. This letter from Knyphausen does not appear to be included in the *Pol. Corr. F.'s.*

[4] *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxi. 365, 469, 547.

[5] Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War*, ii. 334, quoting MS. at Lansdowne House.

[6] *Grenville Papers*, i. 467; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxii. 21, 117, 207, 255, 327.

and Guadaloupe for Grenada and the Neutral Islands and for a boundary in Louisiana, drawn along the Mississippi[1]. A more capable minister than Bute, with the instinct of true statesmanship, would have known how to avoid or to overcome petty disputes and obstacles, and have made all serve towards the great object in view.

Lord Hardwicke considered the question of the Prussian Alliance in a very different manner, and raised it above the minor considerations which decided Lord Bute's action. Writing on February 25, 1762, to the Duke of Newcastle[2], who was then wavering in his support of Frederick on account of the latter's conduct, he ridiculed the absurd notion that had been put forward, that the £670,000 was to be refused in order to save the British nation from bankruptcy. On November 20 of last year, Lord Bute had taken a wise step, which had obtained the full approval and support of Lord Hardwicke. The subsidy had originally been only voted to Frederick annually, and Lord Bute, on proposing the renewal had insisted on the cancellation of Article IV of the Treaty, which bound either party not to make peace without the consent of the other; and to this Frederick under stress of circumstances agreed[3]. Lord Hardwicke, therefore, reminded the Duke that the subsidy had been promised and could not now be refused consistently with the King's honour, and pointed out the great injury which its refusal would probably inflict on the British relations with Russia, to which he had always attached especial importance[4], a fear which was only too well realised. He urged too that allowance should be made for Frederick's warlike enthusiasm, who found himself suddenly raised from the depths of despair to the highest expectations of success. In an interview with Lord Bute on April 13, he did not deny that if the whole question had to be decided by financial considerations and by the King of Prussia's general conduct alone, the German war subsidy could not be defended. But he repudiated absolutely so "weak" and narrow a manner of considering it, and declared that it was to be "determined upon higher and larger principles, and that the eyes of the whole nation and of all Europe were upon the English ministry to see that they made the right advantages of this revolution

[1] *Bedford Corr.* iii. 76.

[2] Below, p. 345.

[3] Schaefer, ii. *b*, 428, 454; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxi. 108, 186, 192, 201; Ruville, ii. 184, iii. 35; N. 247, f. 278.

[4] Below, p. 359.

in Russia[1]." "A million more," cried Pitt in the House of Commons, "would be a pittance to place you at the head of Europe and enable you to treat with efficacy and dignity. Save it not in the last critical year!...or avow to the House of Bourbon that you are not able to treat at the head of your allies....Let a man so narrow-minded stand behind a counter and not govern a Kingdom[2]." Sir Joseph Yorke regretted that personal feelings had got the upper hand and were to decide national measures, and pointed out to Bute the mischief of the step contemplated, especially in Holland. The Duke of Newcastle told the King that his royal honour was involved, and that after such a withdrawal, the Powers of Europe could never look up to him again as their Protector against the House of Bourbon, and must singly make their own terms[3].

The disadvantages which attended the separation from the King of Prussia were so clear and so grave that it was some time before Bute's resolution was taken[4]. He opposed the motion to withdraw from the continent, introduced by the Duke of Bedford, on February 5 in the Lords, which was rejected by 105 votes to 16. He declared that such a measure "would be attended with disgrace and infamy and destruction," though, according to Fox, he was even then of Bedford's opinion[5], and the number of Lords in the King's service who voted for it was a subject of general surprise[6]. In the Commons, in the debate on the same topic on December 9 and 10, on which occasion a memorable speech was delivered by Charles Yorke on the German war, and in just appreciation of the late King, who had been ungenerously attacked and still more ungenerously left undefended, the advocates of the withdrawal from the continent met with little support[7]. In the middle of February another motion on the same subject was withdrawn without debate. In several conversations, moreover, with Lord Hardwicke, when the latter employed all his influence and reasoning to keep him firm, Lord Bute had seemed resolved to prosecute the war and to support the King of Prussia.

[1] Below, pp. 348–51.

[2] Walpole, *George III*, i. 76, 131.

[3] Below, pp. 341, 358; N. 252, f. 140.

[4] Below, pp. 333–4, 339, 341, 347 sqq., 355–7.

[5] Lord Shelburne's *Life*, i. 127, 130.

[6] J. Y. to Mitchell, Add. 6836, f. 151; see also Lord H.'s Notes of the debate printed in *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1218, in which, however, there is no record of his participation.

[7] See below, p. 339; Walpole's *George III*, i. 88, 96.

But the impossibility of completing the domestic political plan, which was Bute's chief object, during the continuance of the war, at last turned the scale. In a Council on April 30, the Prussian subsidy was definitely refused, Lord Hardwicke, and the Dukes of Devonshire and Newcastle alone, and in vain, opposing the disastrous decision[1].

The Duke of Newcastle, who had already submitted to many open affronts and to gross neglect, but who had been dissuaded by Lord Hardwicke from making any small personal points the occasion of his quitting office, now announced his resignation, which took place on May 26[2]. He retired with great dignity and acted with conspicuous temper and moderation, refusing all gifts from the Crown, in whose service he had spent forty-five years of office and a fortune computed variously from £200,000 to half a million[3]. "The manner of your going out," wrote the Duke of Cumberland to him without flattery, "has more decency and dignity than I have seen in my period[4]." The same circumstances marked his retirement as had that of Pitt. He went out, not as the leader of a great party, but alone, and accompanied, according to his own wish, by none of his many adherents, who kept their places and attended Lord Bute's levées[5]. The Duke of Devonshire remained in office, but came to no more Councils.

Only Lord Hardwicke himself followed the Duke of Newcastle in his retirement. The final step of quitting the administration was not taken by himself, nor was any notice sent by the new Cabinet of the intention to exclude him. But after the Duke of Newcastle's resignation he ceased to receive the usual summons to the Council, and at the beginning of June 1762 he was looking forward for the first time in his life to reading the King's Speech in the public newspapers; while in the following November, he was formally left out of the list of the Cabinet ministers, together with the other Whig lords[6]. His course was at length finished; the evening of his long laborious official life had now come, when the load of public service which had lasted without an interruption

[1] Below, p. 352; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 76.

[2] Below, pp. 352 sqq.; H. 13, f. 4.

[3] See vol. i. 228; *Malmesbury Corr.* (1870), i. 84. According to a correspondent of A. Mitchell, the Duke once possessed an income of £25,000 in land and £11,000 from public employments, which was now reduced to scarcely £6000 a year. *Chatham Corr.* ii. 206 (*n.*).

[4] N. 254, f. 9; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 179 *n.*

[5] Add. 6834, f. 37; *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 65.

[6] Below, pp. 359, 435, 504.

from March 23, 1720 to the present time—for the few months at the end of 1756 and beginning of 1757, in which his political activity was most usefully employed, cannot be excepted—might be laid down. His great services to the royal family and to the state were now finally dispensed with, without a word of recognition, acknowledgment, regret or gratitude. No good wishes from the King followed him into retirement. He had not even "the honour of an invitation to dinner on his Majesty's Birthday." The neglect was the subject of general remark and astonishment, but by himself was either overlooked or else merged and forgotten in the relief felt at the escape from duties and attendance, which had become useless and odious, and in the satisfaction at finding himself, as he thought, at last in harbour[1].

VERSES BY LORD LYTTELTON, *January* 1763.

Hardwicke, from fifty Years of Public Toils
At length withdrawn (tho' still thy Country's Voice,
Demands thee back, and still thy vigorous Soul
With all its wonted Love of Britain glows),
How blest thy calm Retreat!—how much above
The richest Gift, that e'er the wanton Hand
Of giddy Fortune to her Vot'ries dealt!
Power is not thine; but, what no Power can give,
Authority, thy venerable Age
Attends unshaken; and, whilst Envy stills
Her hissing Snakes, more loud, exulting Fame
Her sweetest Notes of Gratulation sings[2].

[1] Below, pp. 392, 396.

[2] H. 249, f. 242.

CORRESPONDENCE

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 72, f. 105.] COCKPIT, *Oct. 26th*, 1760.

MY DEAREST LORD,

Forgive me for saying that for the first time in my life I think I see not quite so much consideration for your poor friend in distress, as I have always, in every instance, before found and acknowledged with the utmost gratitude. God knows, and my friends know, the distress I am in. Nobody's advice equals yours with me, and my fate, or at least my resolution, probably must be taken before to-morrow evening; and therefore I most ardently beseech your Lordship to be in town so as to dine with me to-morrow[1].

I will give you a short account of what has passed since our ever to be lamented loss. Mr Martin[2] had orders to send to me yesterday upon the road to come immediately to the new King at Carlton House. I first went to Kensington, and there put on my clothes and went to Carlton House where I expected to meet the Council, but upon my arrival found Mr Martin and he explained it that I was to come alone. Immediately my Lord Bute came to me and told me that the King would see me before anybody, or before he went to Council; that compliments from him, Lord Bute, now were unnecessary, that he had been, and should be, my friend and I should see it. I made suitable returns and was called in to the King. He began by telling me that he desired to see me before he went to Council, that he had had always a very good opinion of me; he knew my constant zeal for his family and my duty to his Grandfather, which he thought would be pledges or proofs of my zeal for him. I said very truly that no one subject his Majesty had, wished him more ease, honour, tranquillity and success in the high station to which Providence has now called him, and I think I can't shew my duty to my late royal master better than by contributing the little in my power to the ease and success of the reign of his Grandson and successor. His Majesty said these remarkable words,—"My Lord Bute is your good friend; he will tell you my thoughts at large," to which I only replied that I thought my Lord Bute was so. Mr Pitt was not sent for to Carlton House till some hours after I had been there, and suspects, and indeed said, the declaration was concerted with me. Whereas I did not know one single word of it till the King communicated it to my Lord Holderness, Mr Pitt and myself, and ordered me to read it, which I did very clearly and distinctly. His Majesty said these words: "Is there anything wrong in point of form?" We all bowed and went out of the Closet. Mr Pitt

[1] *I.e.* instead of coming in the evening as Lord H. had proposed.

[2] Samuel Martin, Secretary to the Treasury.

afterwards said he did not hear it distinctly, particularly the last words. I then from memory repeated it to him. He wrote last night to Lord Bute. He had a conference of two hours and told me that as far as related to himself, Pitt, it was as satisfactory as he could wish. In short Pitt was extremely hurt with the declaration, projected, executed and entered in the Council books, of which he had no previous notice[1]. It was at first, engaged "in a bloody war." That, says Pitt, is false, in the English [?] part of it. We are *sine clade victor*, and that the last words about peace certainly hurt him. He said the allies were left out, and to be short, it is altered and Mr Pitt's words put in; but Lord Bute is not pleased. I was to have had my meeting with his Lordship this morning but he had put it off till to-morrow morning: that is for some reason. My opinion is they will give me good words and conclude, as is true, that I shall willingly go out. I must have your advice. The King has distinguished the Solicitor[2], called him in, was very gracious asking when you would come, and the Solicitor and I earnestly beg you would dine with me to-morrow.

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[On October 27, 1760 (N. 228, f. 382), Lord Hardwicke writes to the Duke of Newcastle from Wimpole at 6 o'clock in the morning, regretting that the Duke should have attributed his not coming to town earlier to a want of friendship or consideration for him. It was impossible for him in his family circumstances to get away sooner. He was now dressing to start immediately, and hoped to arrive at Newcastle House at 6 o'clock in the evening.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 72, f. 108.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Oct. 28th*, 1760.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I hope you find yourself not the worse for your great goodness to me last night. I thank God I am pure well this morning. My friend V[iry] has been with me this morning. He tells me B[ute] and P[itt] are agreed. All (?) p[ub]l[ic] measures are to be supported. P[itt] told B[ute], if he would take the Treasury P[itt] would support him. But he advised him against it. B[ute] said he never thought of it. P[itt] said the D. of N. should continue. B[ute] said he never thought otherwise. My friend told me—continue here to do all their business, and the load, perhaps the blame, of all miscarriages fall upon you,—and my friend repeated to me almost the same words and the same advice

[1] Above, p. 262. [2] Charles Yorke.

that you, my dearest Lord, gave me last night*, for which I shall ever be obliged to you, and am determined to follow your advice. I put myself in your hands.

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Hugh Valence Jones[1] *to the Duchess of Newcastle*

[N. 228, f. 405.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Oct. 28th*, 1760.

MADAM,...

My Lord Hardwicke came to town yesterday in the afternoon and was set down immediately at Newcastle House, where he passed the evening; and was, and will be, everything his Grace can wish; and what passed was in the best manner possible.

To take things regularly, my Lord Duke directs me to begin with his conference yesterday morning at ten o'clock with my Lord Bute, which, as far as civility and assurances of personal regard and confidence go, was as well as possible. The first thing said by Lord Bute was that, as his Grace, by my Lord Lincoln, had some time ago acquainted him with his sentiments and wishes of retreat in case of the unfortunate event which had now happened, he (Lord B.) should be glad to know whether my Lord Duke continued in the same way of thinking; and then added that he had the King's orders to ask his Grace what was his real inclination. My Lord Duke answered, that his sentiments and inclinations were not in the least changed but remained quite the same as they were....Lord Bute then said, the King wish'd that his Grace would continue in the Treasury; that his Majesty thought no other person could do him the same service there; and that he hoped my Lord Duke would not abandon the service of his country at so critical a conjuncture. His Grace replied that he had no favour to ask of the King but that his Majesty would grant him his royal permission to retire....Lord Bute said the King was very sensible of the difference there would be in serving a Prince, with whom my Lord Duke had, in a manner, been brought up and had attended for so many years, and entering into the service of a Prince, so young as he was; but that his Majesty would endeavour to remove that difficulty as far as depended upon him, as soon as possible, and that, addressing himself to him (Lord Bute) the King had said;—"My Lord, it is your business to take care of *that*";—from which Lord Bute took occasion to declare that he would act with the utmost confidence and cordiality towards my Lord Duke, who said that, if he was to continue, he should expect and must insist upon that behaviour. But his Grace persevered to let Lord Bute see that he could not make any other answer than that which he had before given, and particularly without knowing

* The advice was to quit upon a new reign, and a young King who cared not for Joseph. H.

[1] Lord Hardwicke's nephew and secretary to the D. of N.

the sentiments of any of his friends. Lord Bute agreed that that was right.

My Lord Duke went afterwards into the King's Closet and repeating his thanks for his Majesty's gracious message, said he thought himself too far advanced in life to continue in a station which was so laborious, so difficult at this time, and so hazardous. To which the King answered; "I desire you will continue in the Treasury. Nobody can do me so much service there as you." My Lord Duke gave the same answer as to Lord Bute....His Grace made a short relation of what had pass'd to Mr Pitt, who seem'd rather to wish that he should continue.

[The Duke of Devonshire, Lord Mansfield, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Bedford were decidedly of opinion that the Duke should continue; only Lord Hardwicke and Mr Stone with Lord Ashburnham advised that "it was not consistent either with his Grace's honour or personal satisfaction to remain on that foot, upon which alone he could expect to remain." The Archbishop of Canterbury, however,] was gone to my Lord Hardwicke to see whether he can bring him into that system.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 228, f. 414.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, Tuesday night *Oct. 28th*, 1760.

MY DEAR LORD,...

His Majesty began upon the subject which my Lord Bute had mentioned...about the reswearing of Justices of the Peace....His Majesty mix'd what he said upon this subject with great civility to me, and professions of his good opinion of me; and that he had a mind to ask the person whom everybody allow'd to know best etc. He referr'd to what he had said upon my subject to my son, the Solicitor. I said that I had heard, not only from my son but from the Duke of Newcastle, the goodness which his Majesty had expressed for me, and was highly sensible of that undeserved honour. Then I made my professions of duty and zeal for his person and government; that I had long served the late King his grandfather, tho' with great defects of ability, with none in duty and zeal; that he had been a most gracious master to me, and that from rooted principles I maintained the same devotion to his Majesty, and so did all my family....His Majesty said a great deal of his conviction upon that subject, commended Charles and the figure he made; and carried that by his royal assurances of good opinion and inclinations, very high. In short, he said everything that a most gracious Prince could say of that kind, but not one word of any business except the little thing

which he began with....I chose to fling out your Grace's name early in order to give the King an opportunity of saying something on your subject, if he had a mind to it, but his Majesty did not take it up. His manner was extremely gracious during the whole time, and I waited a proper time after he was quite silent, and then made my obeisance....

My dearest Lord, Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 228, f. 426.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Oct. 29th*, 1760, ½ past eleven at night.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am this moment come from my conference with Mr Pitt. Everything passed as well and as friendly as possible....He said there was at present no administration, and till that was settled everything was loose and the public affairs, particularly affairs abroad, would suffer much in the meantime; that your Grace was indispensably necessary to be part of that administration; that he had most fully and expressly declared that to my Lord Bute and to the few other persons with whom he had talked on the subject; declared how sincerely he wished to continue to act with you, upon whom he could depend; that tho' you and he might differ in opinion now and then upon a particular measure, it was always without *aigreur* or ill-humour, and you both pursued the same general point sincerely, and that was the whole. He ask'd what could Lord Bute mean by declaring that he would be a private man? And shadowed out, tho' he did not say it, that he must mean to be *the* minister behind the curtain; that for his part he knew no more of what was intended to be the plan of administration than I did, and that nothing more had been opened to him than he had told; that this he knew, that he and my Lord Holderness dangled at Court with a bag in their hands, but they were not ministers; that people seeing him with that bag, came and asked him questions which he was no more able to answer than any man in the outer room. He insinuated, tho' without directly saying it, that he imagined your Grace would have opened yourself more fully to him, and said he had told the Duke of Devonshire his whole way of thinking upon the subject, and desired he would acquaint you with it. This was interlarded with various things, but he concluded with repeating his ardent wishes that your Grace would continue in, as of necessity.

I began in the way agreed upon between us at parting at the Admiralty; told him what had appeared to me to be your intention on Tuesday, and what had staggered you this day; and I painted the applications and pressing of the Whig party and of the great men of the money'd interest in the City of London as strong and as high as I possibly could....I told him,...as from myself, that a reasonable degree of power or credit, call it what you will, was necessary to support such a burden as the Treasury is now. I then opened the vast supplies and the vast funds that must be carried thro', and how could that be done without your friends and those who must concur in it, and support it, seeing a certain fixed degree of confidence and authority, and that for a continuance; that otherwise people would unavoidably fall off and be looking out....The person, who was to raise the money and load the people with taxes to an enormous extent, must be seen in a light of stability and of duration to a reasonable degree; that without that people would not trust their money...; that therefore without this credit and authority, and without seeing a certain duration beyond the last session of an old Parliament, and where the influence was to be in the election of a new one, I did not see how a man of sense could venture to embark....[To this Pitt entirely agreed.] I should have added that he said further for his part, he did not desire to have the choosing of a new Parliament, but only to have some of his friends taken care of.

I then proceeded to the militia....He strongly asserted his opinion of the great utility of this militia. However, perhaps he had done better not to have engaged himself to be for a continuance in this session[1] (if proposed), but he was driven to it by the jealousy raised that he had abated of his zeal for the measure itself. I told him...that unanimity was absolutely necessary...; and I would venture to give him my opinion that it was more necessary now to avoid any division between *your friends and his*, and to prevent the appearance of it going abroad into the world *at this time* than ever; that even great things depended often upon appearances and opinion. He said nothing was more true; heartily wished it could be avoided; but said remarkably that the gentlemen who pushed this thing, were not to be wrought upon....The whole passed with the greatest temper and good humour, and with the greatest respect to your Grace....

[1] The three years term of the actual law expired in March 1761.

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 152.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov. 6th*, 1760.

DEAR ROYSTON,

This day at noon I received a summons in form from the Earl Marshal to attend the late King's Funeral....I am a little embarrass'd about such a night attendance; and yet, out of respect to his late Majesty's memory, am inclined to go, provided I continue as well, and the weather no colder than it is at present. Few families have more substantial obligations of a lasting kind than mine to that Prince; and I should be sorry to give a handle to anybody maliciously to suggest that a grateful respect had not been shewn to his Remains, which I am sure would be the case if none of us should attend....

Most affectionately yours,

HARDWICKE.

I believe you have not heard that the King did on Tuesday at noon order that I should draw his Speech, in a most gracious manner.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 72, f. 112; N. 229, f. 171.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Nov. 7th*, 1760.

MY DEAR LORD,

Every day produces something less promising than the former. My Lord Bute and Mr Pitt were in a long familiar and serious conversation together for the whole time we were waiting in the outward room, whilst my Lord Anson and I were over against them....[Lord Bute] said this remarkable thing; "The King would have everything go on for the present as it was in his Grandfather's time, and till the several officers are appointed after the expiration of the six months; but when the new appointments are made, the King will then declare whom he would call to his Cabinet Council." So that we are to expect a new one and new things every day....

For myself, I am the greatest cipher that ever appeared at Court. The young King is hardly civil to me; talks to me of *nothing*, and scarce answers me upon my own Treasury affairs, so that at present I am not even my Lord Wilmington, to carry Treasury warrants. Is this giving me the countenance and support which is necessary for me to carry on his Majesty's business, much less what is sufficient to make me happy and easy*?...

* I must observe once for all in the D. of Newcastle's correspondence a great want of manly decision or vigour of judgment, which often proved inconvenient and in the end fatal (in a Court light) to himself and his friends. H.

[Lord Hardwicke in reply, on the same day (N. 229, f. 169), expresses his sympathy and regret for the Duke's unpleasant situation, and endeavours to explain the King's attitude by his reserve. He enclosed a draft of the King's Speech.]

Lord Royston to the Solicitor-General

[H. 12, f. 304.] *Nov. 13th*, 1760.

DEAR BROTHER,

I believe the Cabinet Council upon the expedition was a remarkable one. The far greater majority went swimmingly for it, Mr Pitt pushing it on, answering for the good effects of it. "Belleisle taken would be a place of arms all the next summer, etc.," Bute strongly concurring; "It would be a blot on the King's reign to open by laying aside such an expedition, etc." D. of Newcastle was dissentient; I doubt did not perform very ably. Lord Hardwicke, I presume, was so too, stated many objections,—said he had declared his mind freely; thought he saw a general desire to make court to the rising sun—and was confirmed more than ever in the original advice which he gave the Duke of Newcastle[1]....

I think Bute began the first week by cajoling our friends. When he had brought them over, he has fallen in with Mr Pitt as to *measures* and means to keep the young King in his own hands, and to rule all at Court and in the interior of the Palace....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 72, f. 116.] CLAREMONT, *Nov. 16th*, 1760.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I sent your Lordship's draft, as you know, to my Lord Bute, very early yesterday morning; and to my great surprise, I received this moment the enclosed letter and paper from my Lord Bute. I make no observation but that this method of proceeding can't last. We must now (I suppose) submit....*His Majesty will have them inserted and for that purpose wrote them out himself*[2].

I conclude you will be to-morrow at [the] Cabinet Council.... I doubt there must be some notice taken of these *royal words* both in the motion and address. I suppose you will think *Britain* remarkable. It denotes the author to all the world[3].

[1] To resign.

[2] See Lord Bute's letter, f. 117, and the paragraph in the K.'s handwriting, Add. 32684, f. 121.

[3] *I.e.* instead of England, supposed by the Duke to show the handiwork of Lord Bute. (See Stanhope, *Hist. of England* (1846), iv. 318.)

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston [*who was to move the Address in the House of Commons and who had sent to his Father for his approval the minutes of his speech*].

[H. 4, f. 307.] *Nov. 17th*, 1760.

[He sends the paragraph below which he had "thought of upon his pillow" and inserted in the draft of the Address to the King:]

"We are penetrated with the condescending and endearing manner in which your Majesty has expressed your satisfaction in having received your birth and education amongst us. What a lustre does it cast upon the name of *Briton*, when you, Sir, are pleased to esteem it among your glories!"

Rt. Hon. William Pitt to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 75, f. 215.] *Nov. 21st*, 1760.

My Lord,

This is the first moment in my power to return your Lordship my sincere thanks for the trouble you was so good to take in suggesting a doubt with regard to the marines to be employed on the expedition [to Belleisle]....I now come with great impatience to what is so interesting to your Lordship, as well as matter of most particular satisfaction to myself, that is the great and able, as well as truly candid and handsome manner in which Lord Royston acquitted himself yesterday[1]. I assure your Lordship that I make no compliment when I say that I never heard a more judicious performance, or more exactly adapted to a most solemn and peculiar situation. It was truly becoming the occasion and becoming himself. I am ever, with greatest truth and respect,

Your Lordship's most obedient and most humble Servant,

W. Pitt.

Infinitely obliged to your Lordship's attention, I find myself not worse for the attendance of yesterday.

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke

[N. 230, f. 131.] Newcastle House, *Nov. 28th*, 1760.

...[Mr Pitt] seems more disposed to think seriously of peace than he has ever yet been. He has talked very strongly to me upon it and desired I would talk to your Father, and they are to meet and consider together what method to take and how to begin

[1] In moving the Address in the House of Commons.

to put the great object in motion. Our first difficulty is with the King of Prussia. We must know his thoughts, and both Mr Pitt and myself have talked strongly to the Prussian ministers....

I wish you would send me any lights....I think information would not give so much jealousy now, as when I really was *something* and had a credit.

Ever most affect. yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Major-General the Hon. Joseph Yorke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 230, f. 226.] HAGUE, *Decr. 2nd*, 1760.

...The most material part of your Grace's letter, a very interesting one indeed it is, relates to the dawning of peace from a quarter where it formerly seemed to meet with more difficulty, and I hope...that a regular plan may be form'd and pursued for that purpose. France certainly wants it; and by all I can discover, never varied in its language upon the subject, I mean the making a separate peace with England, and leaving us at liberty to assist the King of Prussia, whilst she remained faithful to her primitive engagements with Austria (viz. the 24000 men), and abandoned the advantages she had, or was to obtain[1], which they would *bona fide* make known to us; upon any other footing they declare themselves unable to treat, and are certainly capable of lingering out the war upon the Rhine by a supply of fresh troops to keep their army superior to ours, whilst they determine to abandon their marine commerce and colonies to our superiority by sea..

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 72, f. 129; N. 230, f. 268.]
NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Decr. 3rd*, 1760 at night.

MY DEAREST LORD,...

Mr Pitt told me he must have half an hour's discourse with me in the course of this day....I did not indeed imagine the business was of the importance I found it. When I came, he shew'd me after many excuses, a letter he received the day before yesterday, all wrote in the King of Prussia's own hand. It was indeed full of the highest compliments to Mr Pitt, as the only man that his Prussian Majesty depends upon, that as a Vrai Romain he would suggest everything that could be suggested for the good of the whole. These compliments made Mr Pitt blush. But the serious part of the letter was extremely material and comfortable; and I own I liked the flattery, as I think Mr Pitt may have great weight with the King of Prussia, in putting some end to this expensive war. The King of Prussia says in the utmost confidence

[1] Ostend and the Austrian Netherlands.

to Mr Pitt that, tho' he has gained advantages over his enemies (and this letter was wrote the 7th of last month, four days after the battle of Torgau), yet he cannot conceal from Mr Pitt that the enemy had their advantages also: and that considering their great superiority, *he could not flatter himself with being able, pour faire plier l'ennemi de gagner quelque avantage décisif sur eux; ou de le*[*s*] *faire abandonner leur orgueil et leurs vues ambitieuses.*

This is the sense, tho' I think I have not quite put it in the order it was in the letter[1]. His Prussian Majesty then goes on to say that in these circumstances he relies upon Mr Pitt's superior talents, to find out *quelque tempérament* to put an honourable end to this war, especially ruinous to all parties.

This, I think, is the substance of the letter, and I like it extremely. It shows the King of Prussia despairs of gaining anything by the continuance of the war. It puts a confidence in Mr Pitt, which encourages him to pursue the measure of peace, as your Lordship will see by the sequel of this letter. [Lord Bute, on being shown the letter, said little and treated it as of small importance. Pitt had urged on Knyphausen, the Prussian minister, the necessity of the King of Prussia's explaining the terms on which he would desire peace, whether there might be a declaration to all the Powers at war of our desire for peace, whether Frederick would give up something to detach Russia from the enemy, and whether he would approve of a separate peace between England and France.] Mr Pitt afterwards entered more specifically than ever upon what might be the terms of our peace with France[2].

He laid it down that we must give up considerably, but we must retain a great deal at the same time. He divided his propositions then, either to retain all Canada, Cape Breton and exclude the French from their fishery on Newfoundland, and give up Guadeloupe and Gorée; or retain Guadeloupe and Gorée with the exclusion of the French fishery on Newfoundland, and give up some part of Canada and confine ourselves to limits of the lakes etc. I told him I knew there were different opinions upon these two points. Some were for retaining all Canada, as our Northern Colonies would never be quiet without it, and give up Guadeloupe. Others thought the retaining of Guadeloupe in reality more advantageous for us, but that I feared the insisting upon the French's renouncing their right to their fishery on Newfoundland would be very difficult to obtain[3].

Upon the whole, to do him justice, he seemed to be in the best disposition. I pressed him much to set things a-going and to come to some immediate resolution. I think he will do it. And tho' his present ideas can never be obtained, he did not talk of one of them as *sine qua nons.*

He will come to your Lordship to-morrow, after Court, if possible.

[1] See the letter, *Chatham Corr.* ii. 77.

[2] See further H. to N., N. 230, f. 399, December 11, 1760.

[3] The Duke here showed his foresight. See below.

He wished I would inform you of what he had said to me. He enjoined the secret in the strongest manner, out of regard to the King of Prussia....He observed upon the difficulty of transacting business of this consequence in our present situation and said very remarkably: "Formerly, my Lord, if I had not had an opportunity to see the King, if you told me that you would answer for the King's consent, that was enough; I was satisfied. Where is that satisfaction to be had now?"

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Rt. Hon. William Pitt to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 75, f. 219.] *Decr. 5th*, 1760.

MY LORD,

I feel too sensibly the honour you do me by the very obliging expressions of your letter to defer a moment returning your Lordship my sincerest acknowledgments for such a mark of your favourable sentiments on my subject. I mean no compliment when I assure your Lordship that I shall seize with pride, as well as real satisfaction, all occasions, public and private, of testifying how much I am persuaded that all marks of consideration towards your Lordship are debts not favours, and greatly for the credit of the King's Government[1]. My sincere wishes meet those your Lordship so obligingly forms for harmony, union and concert of measures between me and those I so truly respect. I am ever with perfect truth and respect, my dear Lord, your most faithful and affectionate humble servant,

W. PITT*.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 72, f. 245; N. 237, f. 19.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *April 17th*, 1761.

...Mr Pitt had a very long audience of the King. When he came out he told me part of it, and his Majesty told me the rest. Mr Pitt said he had laid his thoughts fully before the King; that he had told his Majesty that he did by no means think of the state of the war as other people did; that he was far from doing it, even with regard to the war in Germany; that he thought the total destruction of the French in the East Indies, the probability of

[1] The allusion is probably to the appointment of Lord Royston to the Privy Council, who took the oaths December 17, 1760. H. 12, f. 312.

* The history of the sort of acquaintance which the Family has had at times with this extraordinary person would be curious. I can never forget the usage which my brother received from him when he came in last [in 1766 when Charles Yorke was entirely passed over in the arrangements for the new Government,] and the manner in which Lord Br[eadalbane] was removed without compensation or even the distant assurance of it. H.

taking Martinico, and the effect that this expedition on Belleisle might have, as well as the probable events of this campaign, would enable us to get a peace, which should secure to us all Canada, Cape Breton, the islands, the harbours, the fisheries, and particularly the exclusive fishery of Newfoundland; that if he was ever capable to sign a treaty without it, he should be sorry that he ever got again the use of his right hand, which use he had but just recovered. He went on railing at the commissariat, as the occasion of all our misfortunes, and particularly that this last miscarriage of that great general, Prince Ferdinand, was (I think singly) owing to the fault of the commissariat and of the Electorate of Hanover, who had furnished them with nothing; that he would vote for an enquiry, if it was proposed. I answered very coolly and very strongly that I should be very glad to have an enquiry; that everything had been done that could be done, and that I was perfectly easy about it. He laid in for an opportunity to charge the rest of the administration, who should differ with him, with having encouraged the French ministers not to yield to his terms.

When I went in to his Majesty, I had it more at large. Mr Pitt made two attacks or charges upon the Treasury; the first, that the Treasury had decried our ability to carry on the war by publishing everywhere the want of money etc. (I forgot to tell the King that that was false; for we are now every day saying what a surprising plenty of money there is). But his Majesty took my part strongly and said it was true money was very scarce. The next attack was upon the commissariat, which had been the occasion of all our misfortunes. The King said he was sure I had done my part, and when Mr Pitt talked of an enquiry, the King said he knew I had given orders for a strict enquiry to be made. He then told the King his scheme of peace. His Majesty understood him, as I did, to mean that we should at first acquaint the French minister, who is expected here, *that these are the terms from which we will not depart.* His Majesty reasoned strongly with him against making any such declaration, or any declaration at all, before we heard what they would propose. But all signified nothing. As to myself and the attack upon me, I told the King that no consideration or threat should hinder me from giving my real opinion upon a point of such importance as peace; that I knew I had done my duty, and that I defied all that Mr Pitt could do, and that I desired his Majesty's protection no longer than my conduct should deserve it. The King made me several pretty compliments and that particularly with regard to corruption, etc., no one enemy that ever I had had, had charged me with it. I withdrew fully satisfied with the King and myself, but more sensible of the injustice and ingratitude of Mr Pitt than ever man was; who, I told the King, whenever any measure of his own miscarried, would fling the blame upon anybody, to get off himself —the King of Prussia, Elector of Saxony* or any other person whatever. Mr Pitt talked strange stuff to me; that if all the King's

* [In Lord H.'s handwriting] Q. Hanover [?].

ministers did not agree, France would do nothing; (that ought to be a lesson for himself), and concluded that there were heads enough, able to make and support a peace without him. Upon the whole, I look upon all he said to me as chiefly designed for a menace in which he will be greatly disappointed; but at the same time I see what I am to expect from him and his blood hounds. I must therefore assert my own innocence, fling myself upon my friends for their advice and assistance, and Mr Pitt shall neither frighten nor change me....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 237, f. 40.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *April 18th*, 1761.

...Mr Pitt's way of talking, is such, as I believe, was never before known between fellow-ministers acting in the same service. Censuring everybody who happens to differ from him and threatening to promote enquiries in Parliament, whilst he continues in place. But I look upon all that as menace in resentment for concurring in the advancement of my Lord Bute[1], and the opposition to Alderman Beckford in the City. How the commissariat has behaved, I do not pretend to guess. It will be well if amongst so many of them, they are all free from blame. But the *commissariat* and the *treasury* are two distinct things, and the former may have done very ill and the latter perfectly well. If such an enquiry should ever be attempted, my Lord Granby's word would go further in the House than a great deal of eloquence.

As to the talk about war and peace, is this country to wage eternal war, and run in debt fifty millions more, upon wild imaginary schemes of conquest? If he meant to scatter terrors in order to frighten people into a rejection of all offers of peace, I hope and trust he will miss of his aim. I am glad the King spoke so strongly to him against making any *peremptory negative declaration* in the first instance. If his Majesty really spoke strongly, possibly that, upon reflection, may have some effect; for I do not believe that either he or his great brother[2] mean to quit. There is now no *reversionary* resource. Instead of an old King and a young successor, a young healthy King and no successor in view....In the meantime [I] beg your Grace will not suffer these things to give you any uneasiness, for I look upon them as *bruta fulmina*....

[1] See p. 265. [2] Lord Temple.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 8.] CLAREMONT, *June 22nd*, 1761.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I conclude your Lordship will, in the course of this day, see the very comfortable letters which came from Mr Stanley last night and which my Lord Bute sent me this morning. There is almost everything we can wish, at least so much, that we are masters (if we please) of an honourable peace. An offer in writing to yield to us all Canada, to have back Guadaloupe, the possession of the fisheries yielded by the treaty of Utrecht and for that purpose only, Cape Breton never to be fortified, and Senegal; to restore Minorca, to yield up immediately Hesse, Gueldersland, Wesel, Cleves and all the French are in possession of in Germany; to let us retain Belle-isle if we choose it[1]....

[On August 1, 1761 (N. 241, f. 125; H. 73, ff. 27 and 34), the Duke of Newcastle sends Lord Hardwicke the paper of points of July 24 despatched to Stanley in Paris by Pitt to communicate to the French government. These, says the Duke, appear agreeable to what was settled in Council, but are not written in such a manner as to procure the consent of France, and contain "some very offensive expressions." Nevertheless, Lord Bute had declared that Pitt was earnest and sincere now in desiring peace, and had been ever since he had been over-ruled on the subject of the Newfoundland fishery, "by which he [had] hoped to please his friends in the City."]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 241, f. 140.] WREST, Sunday night, *August 2nd*, 1761.

MY DEAR LORD,

...The most material papers are the paper of points[2], the letter to Mr Stanley and that to my Lord Bristol. As to the two former, of which I was never less edified with any performances that have come from *that hand*, the compositions are inelegant and awkward and full of rough and offensive expressions. How far the agent will think himself at liberty to depart from the language of his principal, in discourse, I know not; but the paper of points must be delivered as it is, saving the translation, and that is in a very haughty and dictatorial style, more strongly so than any which I remember to have seen of Louis the 14th in the height of his glory and presumption. In short, there runs thro' both the air

[1] See also various papers relating to the terms in this vol. of the MSS. H. 73, *passim*.
[2] Of July 24, see p. 318.

of a man not disposed to conciliation. But I go further, for I cannot quite agree with your Grace that the substance of the points is conformable to what was determined in Council,...particularly in the great article of the fishery; as to which the offer is only this, that if France shall agree to put Dunkirk upon the foot of the Treaty of Utrecht, his Britannic Majesty will consent to enter upon the consideration of the privilege allowed by the 13th article of the same Treaty, in relation to the fishery. This is in effect no offer at all....I understood the article relating to the East Indies to be the only one that was agreed to be left uncertain as a subject of future discussion, because it was, in the present state of things, impossible to reduce it to precision....

One of the most melancholy parts of our case is what relates to Spain. Mon. de Fuentes's conversation with Mr Pitt appears to me to be as bad as possible; and his avowal of the court of France being authorized by his court to make the proposal concerning their disputes with us, very important. Nothing will encourage France half so much as the assurance that Spain will take part with them; and if that should come to be the case, I don't see how we should be able to deal with such an alliance, notwithstanding all our high spirits. That event must be taken into the prospect....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 241, f. 308.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *August 8th*, 1761.

...You know I was never of their opinion, who said at the beginning of this reign—"Make the trial and if you find that you are not treated as you ought to be, you may quit more easily afterwards than now." I always thought it would be more difficult, and therefore was humbly of opinion that some decent stipulations should be made. For at the late King's death, several plausible temperate and decent reasons might have been alleged, which now exist no longer. If your Grace quits now, it must be either upon the reasons of *personal usage* or of *public measures*. Forgive me to say that the promotion of the Bishop of Norwich to the see of London[1], contrary to your opinion and advice, will not be thought a sufficient justification by the public or by the Whig party; [and to go out on the plea of the impossibility of raising further funds for the war would be to impair the public credit]....

[1] Thomas Hayter, translated from Norwich; died next year.

[On August 17 and 22 (N. 242, f. 68; H. 73, ff. 54, 60) the Duke again announces his determination to resign office, being no longer able to endure his treatment.]

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 183.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *August 15th*, 1761.

DEAR ROYSTON,

Tired with the attendance of two very long disagreeable days, I sit down to thank you for your kind letter of the 11th. Our first meeting was on Thursday, when we sat from half an hour past one till half an hour past seven; and yesterday from two till half an hour after five. Very stormy they were, but we rid out the tempest. Mr Pitt had had no conference with Bussy, tho' the latter had asked one by letter. The reasons assigned for declining it were taken from some passages in the letter relative to the return of the French memorial concerning Spain, and of the other concerning the King of Prussia's countries and places, conquered by the arms of France; but more particularly by reason of a strong complaint made of the *ton impératif et peu fait pour la négociation* us'd in the letter sending back those two memorials, and in the paper of points. We know that the draft of Bussy's letter was transcribed to him *in haec verba* by the Duc de Choiseul with orders to send it, as it was. You guess who was much hurt by this: tho' on my conscience I think the balance of words is still on our side. After much altercation and some thumps of the fist on the table, it was at last carried (on my motion) that the conference should be had; but not without an answer to Bussy's letter, by which the interview was to be appointed. The meeting of yesterday was professedly upon the draft of that answer. It was produc'd; much too long and too irritating. Several objections were humbly made and strongly supported; but not a word would be parted with. *We would not suffer our draft to be cobbled.* Neither side receded, but it will go as drawn. If after this letter Bussy agrees to the conference, without fresh orders from his Court, I shall think it a good sign that France has no mind to break off the negotiation. A long letter was read from your friend Stanley[1] of just half a quire of folio paper in a close hand. It is a very able one, tho' with a mixture of flights, and improprieties. But he says, in so many words, that he is absolutely convinced and sure that the French Court will as soon part with

[1] Stanley had been a schoolfellow.

a province of old France as with *the entire fishery*, and that he is no more attended to when he talks upon that subject than if he talked of affairs in Japan[1]. Mon. de Choiseul says that he should be pulled to pieces in the streets of Paris. There are also some civil but strong observations upon the style of *his Principal*, which you may be sure contributed not a little to the ill-humour[2]. I remember Sir Robert Walpole used to say that two nations might be writ into a war; and so I think they may into perpetuating a war....

Most affectionately yours,

HARDWICKE.

Your great neighbour [the Duke of Bedford] stood by us very manfully; and your other neighbour, my Lord President [Lord Granville] with much firmness, tho' very improperly interrupted by ——....

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 188.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Aug. 22nd*, 1761.

Hi motus animorum, atque haec certamina tanta,
Temporis exigui spatio suspensa quiescunt[3].

We had two meetings this week; the same persons present, twelve in number. On Wednesday from two o'clock to eight, and on Thursday from two to half an hour after five. All was calm and decent. The great points, liberty to fish in the Gulf of St Lawrence, and an *abri*. Many speeches—at last *both* agreed to by *all*; those, who had the most violently opposed, professing to acquiesce in the opinions of others for the sake of preserving unanimity in the King's Council....It is also agreed to speak clearly now about Dunkirk being put on the foot of the Treaty of Aix, and the liberty of fishing and drying fish on Newfoundland, according to the 13th Article of the Treaty of Utrecht. It has been also agreed to close with the *bonne foi* of the French King's declaration about Nieuport and Ostend; and that each side (after our particular peace made) may assist their respective allies in money only. Thus far is settled, and we meet on Monday to fix the particular place for the *abri*, which does require information and consideration.

[1] Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 565.

[2] Stanley had ventured to expostulate with Pitt on the dictatorial and aggressive tone of his despatches, p. 284.

[3] Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescunt (Virg. *Georgics*, iv. 86).

I suppose the despatch to your friend Stanley may go on Wednesday. Whether this will do now, I don't pretend to prophesy; but I believe it would have done some time ago[1]. Much will now turn upon their boasted union with Spain which, I fear, has gone a great way. I should have told you the conference between Mr Pitt and Bussy was had, but that did not advance the negotiation much. Mr Pitt's letter to Mon. Bussy was sent as drawn....They seem to endeavour to chicane about the limits of Canada on the side of the Ohio. Here we stand at present....

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke, K.B.

[N. 243, f. 211.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Sept. 18th*, 1761.

...We lost *l'heure de Bergier* [du Berger], and that I thought from the beginning. We had, or pretended to have, such a diffidence of M. Choiseul's sincerity at first as gave him such doubts of *our sincerity*, that he found himself obliged, in interest, to adopt another system by way of resource.

That new system with Spain, and perhaps some further engagements with the two Empresses, has embarrassed M. de Choiseul so much that when we grew more reasonable and made our *proper* concessions, he was so engaged in his new measures, that he sent over the last equivocal memorial, to be presented by Bussy, as the *ultimatissimum* of their *ultimatum*[2]; and that answer, receding even from many of their former concessions, could not be accepted. And this I really take to be the true state of the case....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 65; N. 243, f. 259.] CLAREMONT, *Sept. 20th*, 1761.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I am persuaded your Lordship knows how much I feel for you[3]....My best and most sincere wishes and prayers will always attend you and yours. I can't pretend to give any advice; your own great and virtuous mind will suggest more comfort and fortitude to you than I can pretend to do.

It may not perhaps be altogether improper, if it is, I heartily ask pardon, to endeavour to divert, for one moment, a melancholy private subject to the depending distress of the public.

Your Lordship saw in what confusion the meeting of the Lords was the other night[4]. [He, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Mansfield and Lord Bute had met, by the latter's desire, at Devonshire

[1] Cf. Stanley's own opinion to the same effect, p. 285.
[2] Of August 5 and 10, p. 271.
[3] On the occasion of Lady Hardwicke's death the day before.
[4] That of September 18, p. 275.

House yesterday.] Lord Bute behaved in the most cordial and most frank manner that ever I knew. He began by lamenting that your Lordship was not there, as well as the cause of it. He told us all that had passed between my Lord Temple, Mr Pitt and him (for they are all joined at last); that he had used his utmost endeavours (as my Lord Mansfield had also done) to induce Mr Pitt to lay aside his absurd and offensive paper[1]; that all he could say did not prevail, but, however, that he thought he had got him not to sign it, and at last not to give the paper to the King, but Mr Pitt persisted that he would repeat the paper to the King and give it afterwards to my Lord Bute, which is in substance the same. It is lodging his protest with the other Secretary of State to be produced and quoted in Parliament, as an appeal to the public, against the rest of the Council present. My Lord Bute said that, if we had any view of peace, he should be less solicitous what part Mr Pitt took; but that as the continuance of the war seemed unavoidable, he thought we should do what we could, to hinder Mr Pitt from going out, and thereby leaving the impracticability of his own war upon us. And I must here observe that my Lord Bute at present, always talks of the war in the present shape, with the addition of Spain, as impracticable. That he (Lord Bute) was ready to do whatever *we* should agree upon, and therefore proposed that we should take down minutes, and wished that I would carry them to your Lordship for your consideration and correction. I dared not trouble you yesterday, and it was at last determined that I should send them to your Lordship this morning; and beg (if it was not too much) that the Duke of Devonshire might wait upon you at seven this evening.

My Lord Bute's view was to have such a minute taken to-morrow at the meeting, as might justify our dissent from Mr Pitt's paper, but in such a manner as might give him the least offence, and particularly so as would not leave it in his power to represent that we had lost the opportunity of putting it out of the power of Spain to hurt us....As the purport of this paper, in its essential parts, agrees entirely with that your Lordship prepared at Council... I very readily acquiesced....I must do justice to my Lord Bute, that he acted with as much cordiality and concert with us as possible and, for the first time, exactly as one of us, and that induced me to be more complying. If your Lordship can see the Duke of Devonshire, I dare say you will settle everything in a quarter of an hour....

I am, my dearest Lord,

Most cordially yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[1] p. 275.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 243, f. 264.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, Sunday night, *Sept. 20th*, 1761.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am deeply sensible of your Grace's goodness for me and that you feel for my present affliction agreeably to the full extent of that friendship, which I have always experienced from you. Indeed, my affliction and distress are consummate. My loss is irreparable, having had the most virtuous valuable friend and companion, with whom I had lived in uninterrupted harmony for above two and forty years, torn from me by one fatal stroke. Your Grace's wishes and prayers for me are kind and affectionate to the highest degree, but my grief is at present inconsolable....My thoughts are distracted and I find it is impracticable for me to fix my attention sufficiently to collect and compare ideas and to form a judgment upon any material points of business. I do not say this affectedly or to withdraw myself; but there are certain moments, in which a man must be excused. Place yourself, my dear Lord, in my situation (which God forbid you should be in), and ask your own heart what you would answer? If I had been inclined to keep away, I had sufficient ground to have done it on Friday noon, when I came from home and left word that if the doctors found any alteration for the worse they should be bring[ing] me word, which foreboding was fatally verified.

[He has however read over the enclosed paper as well as he could and suggests queries and alterations, but prefers his own former note, as less likely to bring on war, and this he sends once more[1].]

Nobody can think themselves more honoured by a conference with the Duke of Devonshire than myself; but I am unfit for any conference, as my spirits are in so weak and tender a state. Therefore if his Grace should call, I shall be sorry but must beg to be excused. I am ever, my dearest Lord,

Your most affectionate and faithful but most afflicted servant,

HARDWICKE.

[1] N. 243, f. 248.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 70; N. 243, f. 303.]

NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Sept. 21st*, near 8 o'clock.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I hope your Lordship finds yourself something relieved by the sleep which I rejoiced to hear you had last night. I am quite ashamed to trouble you with anything of importance at this time....

Mr Pitt brought his paper, or rather *protest*, this day to the King and offered it to his Majesty, who declined accepting it. My Lord Bute was present and said,—"As you, Sir, have given your reasons and those of my Lord Temple for your opinion, it is but reasonable that those who dissented from you, should give theirs also."...The King said to Mr Pitt that he would take no resolution with regard to Spain till Mr Stanley was arrived, for he believed he might give some very necessary lights with regard to Spain. Mr Pitt seemed surprised but said nothing.

When we came to Council...Mr Pitt resumed the debate so far as related to his paper to which he was determined to adhere. Lord Bute spoke and mentioned with great respect your Lordship's absence and my Lord President's which, added to the use that might be had in seeing Mr Stanley, was a reason for putting off this consideration. Mr Pitt replied that he had heard all that the most able men could say; he had not departed from his first opinion and should not; neither did he see any use that Mr Stanley could be of. Lord Bute named the King for wishing to have Stanley here before his Majesty came to any decision.

The Duke of Devonshire and myself spoke strongly for adhering to our former opinion. The Duke of Devonshire prepared the orders to be sent to Lord Bristol to require an explanation what the intentions of Spain were, and to enter into the expedient proposed about the logwood; but in all events, in case of an unsatisfactory answer, my Lord Bristol should immediately come away. My Lord Mansfield spoke long, not very clearly, but rather of our side, laying it down that it did not appear to him what operations could be undertaken against Spain that could suffer by the delay. That gave Mr Pitt a great advantage to expatiate upon his great schemes and the almost certainty of the success against the united force of the House of Bourbon, but then there was not an hour to be lost. Lord Mansfield replied that if that was the case, it would then appear in a very different light, and plainly made fair weather with Mr Pitt.

My Lord Bute mentioned his behaviour to me afterwards, and said, my Lord, "*That is the Man**." Mr Pitt adhered to his paper, said he would not execute any other measure, and insinuated that

* And yet Lord B. made great use of him afterwards. H.

the other Secretary of State might do it. Mr Pitt lamented his situation, repented of the facilities he had been led into in the French negotiation[1], and was determined *now* to abide by his own opinion. He spoke very long, very well and very determined but with great politeness and candour.

His brother-in-law was the very reverse. He spoke long indeed, very pompous, very passionate, very ill-bred but very determined, and shewed plainly that their party was taken to quit, or at least to have no share in any measure but their own. My Lord Temple was very abusive and said he thought that some of the company had paid dear for their unwise relaxations. I took him up, I hope, with spirit, and I think to the satisfaction of my friends.

The meeting ended, adjourned as it were *sine die* for Stanley, and Mr Pitt gave his paper in form to my Lord Bute to be delivered to the King. After all was over my Lord Bute, the Duke of Devonshire and I had a most material conference which they desired I would communicate to your Lordship.

The Duke of Devonshire and I declared that no consideration or threat from Mr Pitt should make us depart from our opinion.

My Lord Bute said we were in the right; that the thing was over; that after what had passed, Mr Pitt and Lord Temple could not stay; besides, if Mr Pitt would execute nothing but his own paper, business could not go on, and therefore he would concert with us what was to be done. We both said that without departing from our opinion, we wished anything might be done, to keep Mr Pitt. My Lord Bute said that was impossible. We then considered who should succeed him. I named George Grenville and Lord Bute liked my naming him, but thought that could not do. [Lord Egremont was also named.]

I am not quite clear that Mr Pitt will quit, but I think it will be impossible to go on together. We three agreed to stand by one another (your Lordship always included) and to do the best we could, if drove to these extremities. The great point amongst us was to do right by the public, and in order thereto, *first*, to form a right minute of our own opinion, in opposition to Mr Pitt's paper, and such an one as may bear the light. I dare not mention what we all three most earnestly desire, that your Lordship would set down your thoughts for such a minute. The two points of the fishery and prizes may be mentioned or not; but I find it is thought that, if Lord Bristol is not to come away upon an unsatisfactory answer, we shall give Mr Pitt great handle against us[2]. The next point is to form a proper memorial or instruction for my Lord Bristol, which, at the same time that it shows spirit, by ordering him away, should be prepared in such a proper manner as may encourage, and not prevent Spain from making a favourable answer....I send your Lordship the papers relating to the Minute; that, if you can bring yourself to look upon them for one quarter of

[1] Cf. p. 272.

[2] According to the Minute (see N. 243, ff. 233, 248) he was to do so.

an hour, you will bring them into a proper shape....The King spoke with the greatest tenderness and respect of your Lordship.

[On September 22 (N. 243, f. 320) Lord Hardwicke replies to the Duke of Newcastle expressing his full approval.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 243, f. 388.] HIGHGATE, *Sept. 27th*, 1761.

MY DEAR LORD,

I concur with your Grace in being much concerned for the last letters from Mr Stanley which I think wear a very bad aspect[1]....I wish it don't appear at last that he has been deceived in some instances. Your Grace says, you *don't agree with Joe's politics, for they give a handle to others.* That is only a consequence, and the question is a question[2] of fact. You know Joe has all along been suspicious of Mon. de Choiseul's sincerity for peace and, I own, so have I at different times, tho' I have been so strongly and cordially disposed towards peace that I have been glad to lay hold of all advantages, and to be convinced by Mr Stanley's positive assertions, and his assurances of the authenticity of his intelligence. But I wish it may not come out that he has been imposed upon to a certain degree[3]. He has certainly very good parts, but he has strong passions and excessive vanity and, as plainly appears, a great love of flattery....But whether there be any or no weight in these observations, and whatever handle Mr Pitt may endeavour to take from these observations or any other of the like nature, still they are, in my humble apprehension, no impeachment of the opinion of the majority of the Council, either as to the terms of peace or the immediate declaring war against Spain. That opinion was founded on the strongest informations and assertions from the minister employed by the King, and particularly chosen, trusted and applauded by Mr Pitt himself; and in respect of the terms of peace supported by the reason of the thing and the circumstances of this country; and your Grace sees that Joe says (in this last letter) that the rest of the world will think us very difficult, and that we shall be thought, or at least said, to have broke off, when we were on the point of making a very advantageous peace.

[1] His former letters had given great hopes of peace (N. 243, ff. 320, 325); Thackeray's *Chatham*, ii. 613 sqq.

[2] Sir J. Y. on September 22 (f. 316) alluded to Choiseul's "tergiversation," and at the same time to the general surprise at the breaking off of the negotiations.

[3] This had been the case during the latter part of the negotiations, p. 271.

As to the opinion against an immediate declaration of war against Spain, I cannot yet repent of that opinion. There were not sufficient proofs to justify the doing of it. It would have been precipitate, rash and dangerous, nor does any time appear to have been lost. Grimaldi's letter to Fuentes of the 13th instant is a new subsequent fact, and only proves that there was an intimate correspondence between Choiseul and Grimaldi on this subject, but whether the delusion was intended with regard to them or to us, was then uncertain.

[He thought Pitt would not resign, nor could Lord Bute really wish him or take upon himself the burden of Pitt's war.]

As to Mr Fox, I own I was surprised to hear his name tossed up on this occasion....I have now no personal prejudices or resentment against Mr Fox. They have been long laid asleep and buried —ever since I assured him that they were so[1]. I have now no opinion or thought in my mind concerning that gentleman, but what arises from such topics, as in prudence, one ought to govern one's judgment by, both in public and private life, I mean his general character and conduct....I do entirely concur in Mr Stone's opinion and conclusion, and think it as judicious and as honest an opinion as I ever read or heard[2]....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 244, f. 139.] JEMMY [PELHAM]'S, *Oct. 9th*, 1761.

[The Duke had discussed with Lord Bute the question of the successor to Lord Temple for the Privy Seal. Lord Hardwicke, it will be remembered, had not been appointed President of the Council in 1760, in order not to give umbrage to Lord Granville and was now, as the Duke supposed, destined for the vacant office.] But when I named my Lord Hardwicke, he seemed to think that my Lord Hardwicke was not the least thought of—sure he was rewarded enough by the great things which were done for his family and with the promise of the President's place. I was astonished and told him my thoughts very plainly as to the use of my Lord Hardwicke, who ought not to be considered as rewarded by favours done to his children; that he was wanted in business;... that the President and Privy Seal were always rewards for Chancellors, etc: of great merit and distinction. It signified nothing; his Lordship ran on in his old way, putting Lord Hardwicke upon the foot of common friends of mine, and then reproached

[1] Above, vol. ii. 188.

[2] Stone had said that the change from Pitt to Fox would be from the most popular man in the Kingdom to the most unpopular. N. 243, f. 363.

me as usual with my friends having everything....He told me Lord Hardwicke said, he had nothing to ask but for his children. I told him, nor will he ask anything. It was mighty natural, his Lordship said, for me to speak for my friends (I would not let my Lord Hardwicke be put off in that manner; sure his consideration arises from himself). At last his Lordship talked of his danger and responsibility and that he must now provide *for friends of his own*;...that he would refer it to any impartial person, whether my Lord Hardwicke ought not to be satisfied, with what had been done for his children and with the prospect of that "great office of President of the Council," and that the King thought of nothing else....I told your Grace some time ago that I thought my Lord Bute's view by confining the concert about business to himself, his two friends, my Lord Egremont and Mr Grenville, and myself, was to get the whole power and disposition of business, as well as employments to himself. I am now fully convinced of it. This unaccountable declaration against my Lord Hardwicke and his putting him upon that low inconsiderable foot of a friend of mine, or as one to be bought or purchased by places or favours to two or three of his sons, viz. Sir Joseph, Jack Yorke and the clergyman[1], shows real want of regard for him or desire of his assistance, and convinces me that the point now is to make me as weak in Council as possible. My Lord Bute has got rid of his rival Mr Pitt, who dared to contradict him; and he will make everybody else as insignificant as he can. This is certainly his scheme....Lord Bute is destroying himself. The whole scheme is blown up if this is not altered....A united cordial administration ought to take the person for such a high office, who can do the King and the public the most service from his ability and character. Can any man in England be put into competition with my Lord Hardwicke in that view?...

[The Duke of Devonshire replies (N. 244, f. 155) that he is convinced neither Lord Bute nor the King had any intention of appointing anyone else to the Privy Seal than Lord Hardwicke; the disagreement between the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Bute must have arisen from ill-temper.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Solicitor-General

[H. 5, f. 268.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Oct. 10th*, 1761.

DEAR CHARLES,

...A great change was made in the political wind-dial before you left us; and you know as far down as Monday night. The next forenoon (being no Levée day) the *principal person*[2] made visits, at least to some, and did me the honour to call at this door.

[1] James Yorke. See above, p. 260.
[2] Pitt.

I was not at home but, considering the condescension of making the first visit on such an occasion, I returned it the same day at noon.

On Wednesday I saw him at the King's Levée, and on Thursday at the Queen's Drawing-Room. Mutual compliments passed, very civil, but rather grave. However, both parties said they would take another opportunity. What is more material is, that in the meantime a negotiation has been carrying on, which has been listened to. Some place was at first proposed, and a new one thought of, *Governor of Canada*, with a great salary. That was treated seriously. Strange! However, it would not do, for it would put us out of the House of Commons absolutely, without a particular act to enable us. It has at last ended in a peerage to Lady Hester, descendable to his issue male, and a pension of £3000 per annum, on the duty of four and a half per cent. on sugars, for his own life, and any other two lives he shall name. This thought was taken from my suggestion in the case of Mr Onslow[1], and agreed to now, because he would not be on the Irish list. By this time I am sure you begin to wonder. It will be in the *Gazette* to-night. Lord Bute called on me yesterday noon, and staid an hour and an half. He showed me the letters which had passed between him and Mr Pitt on this occasion, those of the latter more stiff and laboured even than usual[2]. Vast professions to the King; none to anybody else; but most gratefully accepting the thing in his own and Lady Hester's name. Lord Bute was very complaisant; said many obliging things of me and my sons, and indeed did you all justice, not only in his own name, but the King's. Lord Egremont is Secretary of State of the Southern Province, and accepted the Seals yesterday; and I am going immediately to his door. Lord Temple resigned his Seal also yesterday noon, at which I am a little surprised, considering the part his chief has taken. I was told that he made great professions to his Majesty, but appeared much embarrassed in manner and discourse. Lord Bute did not seem to expect any other resignations. That is uncertain; but how can a man, who goes out with a great compensation, expect his friends to quit for him *gratis*? Lord Temple, indeed, had engaged himself.

The arrangement for the House of Commons has ended in what we heard of. George Grenville remains Treasurer of the Navy, and is to be the declared man, and *porter la parole* there.

[1] Arthur Onslow, the late Speaker.

[2] *Chatham Corres.* ii. 146 sqq.

This everybody in town has agreed to, particularly Lord Barrington. It falls under Gil Blas's chapter of *What Gil Blas did when he could do no better.* The precedents for it are Mr Walpole, Paymaster, at the head of the House of Commons, and Mr Pelham, the like, both for a short time. You will say they don't run *quatuor pedibus.* However, I don't see that we are concerned in this more than others. Those who have abilities, will have *beau jeu....*

Thus things stand at this hour. I think the peerage and pension will operate well for the present on both hands, and surely must produce some quiet at least for this session, which will be a good thing *pro tanto.* I hope you will keep your time fixed for coming to town. I hear my pretty godson is well. God bless you both.

I had yesterday a very kind melancholy letter from poor Joe, who did not know the sad event[1] till last Tuesday.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 112.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Oct. 13th*, 1761.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I was detained by my Lord Bute and Mr Grenville....His Lordship with an air of the greatest gravity and discontent began with making several severe reproaches; that he found things could not go on between us; that his friend Mr G[eorge] Grenville was to be put into the most difficult station, and to be mortified, hurt and not supported....I endeavoured to convince his Lordship how unjust his reproaches were....I then complained on my side of some late discouragements which I had met with, to which I had the usual answer, that I and my friends had everything. I asked his Lordship; "Have I the Great Seal, have I the Secretaries of State, have I the War Office, Army, etc.?" All he could answer was,—I had the Treasury and first Lord of the Admiralty. "In friendship, yes, but the Head of the Admiralty has not always gone as I could have wished."—"My Lord Hardwicke can do what he pleases with him." This sort of stuff hurt me so much that I said shortly but really in good humour,—"Since it is so, for God's sake, let me go out and I will support whomever you put in." His Lordship then took fire and said,—"No, my Lord, I know your power. You have all the great men of the Kingdom; if it was to come to that, that we were incompatible, I would myself retire and desire the King to put his affairs into your hands." I laughed at that. His Lordship talked of his own situation. He had nothing but his credit with the King; he had nothing else to support him; his danger was

[1] The death of Lady Hardwicke.

great; he had few friends, etc.; to which I answered, "You may have all my friends, if you please." I talked pretty home to him upon some points. I think him disturbed, and still desirous to talk and act high towards everybody....

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. This letter wrote in a hurry, worse than ordinary, I believe you cannot read.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 244, f. 227.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Oct. 13th*, 1761.

[He can make little of this *galimatias*, and scarcely read the Duke's letter. But he trusts that such altercations will be avoided.]

When I came home last night I found a very civil answer from Mr Pitt to my note, giving me an appointment this day for twelve o'clock. I staid with him an hour, and never had a better-humoured, more easy conversation with him in my life. There was not a great deal of it material; nor could I relate it in a letter, but the most material part was:—That he did not know how much he should attend Parliament; the supplies he would support to the utmost, both publicly and privately, as well of men and ships as of money. He did not intend to give any disturbance to administration, but if the cause of his quitting should be misrepresented or he should be fallen upon, he should be obliged to set them in a true light and justify himself. Something passed about the point of Spain. He believed that I and the other Lords who differed from him, followed their real opinions; for that he commended them and wished his might be erroneous. I observed that he did not assert the *resolution* of Spain to declare war against us, near so strongly as he did at the Council[1], but put it upon their secret union with France, and that they would assist France with money underhand, which would be as bad for us and perhaps worse. I said I thought that private assistance could not go to any great extent; that if they assisted with ships or men, those would be acts of hostility. We parted very civilly, and I observed he never named any person's name in the whole conversation but Lord Temple's (which I brought on), and he justified his resignation....

[1] Cf. Pitt's speech in the House of Commons, November 13, 1761. "God alone knew what the opinion would be when the whole should come out. The probability was that himself had been erroneous." Walpole's *George III*, i. 74.

[On October 14, 1761 (H. 73, f. 115; N. 244, f. 262), the Duke of Newcastle informs Lord Hardwicke of a conversation with Lord Bute, in which the latter announced to him his desire of putting an end to the continental war in consequence of the unwillingness of the Landgrave of Hesse to send further troops.] Lord Bute wants to have the popularity of carrying on the war in popular places, and the merit of easing the nation of the exorbitant expense upon the Continent. I am afraid this will not do, and it will be found that the only way to ease the nation will be by... bringing about a reasonable peace. [Lord Hardwicke is to give his opinion.]

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke, K.B. to Lord Royston

[H. 17, f. 365.] HAGUE, *Oct. 16th*, 1761.

...At last then the deed is done, and the popular minister has resigned in the ordinary way with a peerage and a pension. I think he is well enough off and, unless he would have employed his talents in a gentler way, I think the government does not lose a great deal. I say this with all due deference to his talents and services; but nobody loves to be overborne, and it is so easy for a man of such parts to gain his ends by mildness and reasoning. I never was clearer upon any point in my life than that he was unjustifiable and impolitic in his proposal to the Council, and...I am convinced he would have been sorry if his colleagues had adopted his fire and let themselves be hurried away into an immediate and unnoticed rupture with Spain. Had this happened, besides the cries of all Europe, we should soon have had the curses of the United Kingdoms, for what a property would have been sacrificed unwarrantably and passionately[1]. [He had always felt doubts concerning the offensive alliance of France and Spain from the information he had received and the absurdity of the measure, and now remained of the same opinion; although some kind of family compact, of not sufficient importance to provoke Great Britain, might have been renewed or strengthened[2].]

[On October 17, 1761 (N. 244, ff. 330, 332), Lord Hardwicke gives the Duke of Newcastle an account of interviews between himself and George Grenville, now a member of the Cabinet, and with Lord Bute. That with the former lasted two hours and a half.] Your Grace knows the manner, and therefore I need not say that ...he was prolix, etc. Your Grace knows he loves to reason and dispute*. [Pitt's letter to Alderman Beckford was most astonishing,

[1] British merchandise in the ports of Spain.

[2] On December 11 he is still incredulous of the hostile intentions from Spain. f. 401.

* My Lord was not very fond of Mr Grenville's prosing, disputative manner. H. (H. 73, f. 121.)

not to be paralleled in history, remarkable for its disclosure of the opinions of the ministers in council and for the strain of vanity running through the whole. It appeared to be the work of a heated brain, carried away by passion.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 123; N. 244, f. 356.] CLAREMONT, *Oct. 18th*, 1761.

MY DEAREST LORD,...

I see my Lord Bute (entre nous) wants to get rid of the continent war...but a too hasty giving up of our allies and abandoning the King's electoral dominions...will, with all reasonable men, affect his Majesty's honour, as much as a less advantageous peace would do....

I just touched yesterday upon Mr Pitt's most *astonishing* letter. Nothing can be more offensive to a King, more insolent in itself, more treacherous to council, or show more marks of a hurt, disappointed heart. But it carries with it also certain proof of malice, revenge and opposition....

"Resolved to ruin or to rule the State[1]."

I am sensible that in this situation, we ought all to do our best for the service of the King and the nation....

I suppose I am to be made the author of Mr Pitt's resignation, and the adviser of all the former pusillanimous measures. *We* can, *I* can, show that before we went out, our views of attack both at home and abroad, were as active, as vigorous, and upon the same principle with Mr Pitt's, of annoying France in all parts; but we had not such good instruments as Mr Pitt had, or indeed (and that was our only fault) not the courage to insist upon them[2]. A cowardly admiral gave up Minorca and by that sullied the honour of our fleet and army in the Mediterranean; a mad unfortunate General occasioned the loss of our first attempt in North America; neither of them named, thought of, or indeed approved by me; representations from me in writing upon the advisability of attempting some operations on the coast, rejected...; but above all forsook and abandoned by the then Secretary of State, who was a considerable part of the administration and the only material one in the House of Commons. These facts are all true; and yet upon the misfortunes of those times will this Mr Pitt endeavour to preserve or regain his former credit and popularity....

[1] Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*, i. 174.

[2] Alluding to the military appointments which were entirely in the hands of the Duke of Cumberland and over which the ministers had little or no control. See above, p. 113.

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 244, f. 260.] *Oct.* 21*st*, 1761.

...I will surprise your Grace....Our friend, Charles Yorke, is so hurt at the usage of his Father and me and *perhaps* at some more tendency [? more at some tendency] which there certainly is at present towards the Attorney General[1] than was formerly, that he has most seriously given me his advice to resign my employment, and thinks it is not consistent with my rank, age and honour to serve as I do, subservient to, and dependent upon and, in short, to use my own word, aide de camp to, my Lord Bute....This very great secret to yourself only.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 244, f. 472.] *Oct.* 23*rd*, 1761.

...I never can, nor will, agree to my Lord Egremont's letter as it now stands. They breathe war as much as Mr Pitt did; but from this principle, for fear of Mr Pitt's popularity, which they would endeavour to gain but will never obtain it; and for that will all our measures be hampered, and this administration (such as it is) confounded. I cannot be in town on Monday, and I had rather see no more of my Lord Egremont's letter[2].

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 244, f. 470.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Oct.* 23*rd*, 1761, at night.

MY DEAR LORD,

I don't wonder that your Grace thought the scene of this day disagreeable. It was really so to me. I am not apt to be captious; but you saw what dependence there was to be had upon the compliments made to the draft at first[3]. Those performances used to have much better quarter from Mr Pitt. However, I have too much pride to be hurt by anything of this kind; but I shall know how to act for the future....The turn of this day was quite different from Mr Grenville's language to me, when we had our conference at my house[4]. But I really believe they are frightened at what passed yesterday in the Common Council, and that has

[1] Sir Charles Pratt. He was, however, soon removed from the House of Commons and appointed Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, when Charles Y. succeeded him as Attorney.

[2] pp. 293–4.

[3] Draft of the King's speech which he had, as usual, drawn up; above, p. 294, and below, p. 336.

[4] Above, p. 333.

operated, in some degree, to change the plan[1]. They certainly must profess in a proper manner to carry on the war in order to peace. But if they think to outdo Mr Pitt in talking and acting up war and warlike enthusiasm, they will run the hazard of losing the soberer part of the nation and not gain over Mr Pitt's followers: for that kind of merit of war, will be all his merit, and even the part they shall take in it will be ascribed to him....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 245, f. 104; H. 73, f. 133.] *October 28th*, 1761, NEWCASTLE HOUSE.

...I had a very uncomfortable conversation this morning, of an hour and a half with Mr Grenville....I found and left him very uneasy. He is apprehensive of making a bad figure; and I could perceive plainly, he is jealous of Mr Fox, of his abilities, his power, his connections and his numerous friends in the House of Commons, whereas he had none.

I told him I thought he had nothing to fear; that Lord Bute was very well satisfied with Mr Fox, who was to speak, or not to speak, and to act entirely as Lord Bute should direct[2]. He said all that was true, but yet...Poor man! he is certainly much frightened and alarmed and I do not wonder at him....

Fox...entered into the whole situation with me; talked a little of George Grenville.—"What is he? What is he to be?"—I said, to take the lead in the House of Commons. Fox is for beginning with Pitt and for pushing things to extremities[3]....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 245, f. 220.] CLAREMONT, *October 31st*, 1761.

...My Lord Hardwicke was so good as to prepare a draft of a most admirable Speech which my Lord 'Bute, for two or three days together, commended to me in the highest degree; and to which there could be no objection, except it might be by some thought too warlike. But after three days reflection, when we (the three ministers)[4], my Lord Hardwicke and I came to meet upon it, Mr George Grenville, who is to hold the pen, had so mangled this poor Speech by inserting some of Mr Pitt's *verba sonantia* and words to point out descents on the French coast, and my Lord Bute a paragraph to get popularity, by conveying to the people that the King would not give up any, the least, interest of this country on any consideration whatever (which his Lordship himself explained to be for the sake of Hanover), that one could hardly know the

[1] An enthusiastic meeting in favour of Pitt had been held in the City, and the members of Parliament were instructed to support the measures for the war. N. 244, f. 406.

[2] See also N. 245, f. 178.

[3] Also N. 245, ff. 225 sqq.

[4] Bute, Egremont and Grenville.

Speech again. However, at our last meeting, when my Lord Mansfield was added, the Speech was settled in the manner I now send it to your Grace, and *we* for prudential reasons acquiesced under it, as well as to the motion as now drawn...to the original draft of which my Lord Bute also made one alteration, to take off any notion of our being pacific[1]....My Lord Bute often reproached me for my pacific disposition; and that in a manner to make me apprehend that that was to be the cry, and that the load which was to turn Mr Pitt's resentment and opposition upon me....

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 10, f. 212.] HAGUE, *November 3rd*, 1761.

...The scene...is as extraordinary a one as I ever read of, and gives me a real concern. No honest man can approve the conduct of the late Secretary, and it is happy for Europe that the Council of England had firmness and honour enough to resist the impetuosity of a man, who has a mixture of wildness in his character very alarming. Since your letter was wrote has appeared that famous one to Mr Beckford[2], which has gone round Europe and has had the same judgment born of it everywhere. I cannot say it gives foreigners a very advantageous notion of our interior; but it gives them a much less one of the writer. Considering everything, I don't know whether it is not better, however, that he took that step, as the sedate part of the nation must see where the shoe pinches and to whose door all this bustle is to be laid; indeed, it had been to be wished that at the beginning of the negotiation with France the same spirit and concert had appeared to moderate Mr Pitt as did at the end....I think we should have had a peace before this time...; and a great happiness it would have been. France has now submitted the negotiation to the world; and when it comes to be read in England, I think most people would think we were well off, if we had obtained a peace as it is there proposed, supposing a few alterations could have been made. I know that from the beginning the French Court was convinced that Mr Pitt did not mean peace, and it was the language of all their Ambassadors in foreign Courts, and to that we may in part attribute the conduct held by that Court. On the other hand, had France been sincere, I must allow that by assisting those in England who were disposed to put an end to the war, another turn might have been given to the negotiation and that desirable work of a pacification obtained; but the Duc de Choiseul is warm and petulant, and his bosom friend, Grimaldi, laid hold of every trifling circumstance to blow up the coals and fill him with suspicions. My notion too is that when you are to receive such advantages, as we were by this Treaty, it is always wise to gild the pill; and France herself has always, or commonly at least, followed that method, in the advantageous treaties she has made at different

[1] See also f. 254.

[2] *I.e.* to Sir James Hodges, p. 281.

periods. The Duc de Choiseul has certainly had the notion in his head of what happened after the Treaty of Gertruydenberg, and hopes to get the French nation on his side by publishing. I wish at the same time he had let it alone, for I believe neither we nor they shall reap any benefit from it, but on the contrary, that the next negotiation will be more embarrass'd....

Lord Royston to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 4, f. 206.] FRIDAY NIGHT, [*Nov. 13th*, 1761].

MY LORD,

I beg pardon for not accepting your invitation, but am really tired and heated with a long attendance. We had a long rambling debate[1], but concluded unanimously without any motions of amendment....Mr Pitt and his friend Beckford spoke a great while. The former apologised for his differing in opinion about the disputes with Spain, and not yielding the fishery in North America. He was ready to submit his conduct in both these points to the House, and hoped in due time the Spanish papers would be called for. He admitted that those who differed with him did it from conviction, and treated them with respect. Mr Pitt declared strongly in support of the German War, suspected the silence from the Court quarter proceeded from no favourable disposition towards it, but foresaw very bad consequences if we deserted it. He really treated the topic ably and like a man who would not give up his opinion. His speech in general was artful and able, and he spoke more modestly to the House than he did in Council....He disowned the publication of his letter, and that he seldom read newspapers.... I forgot to mention that Mr Pitt declared his opinion that, if the negotiation was resumed, we should make the exclusive fishery in the Gulf a *sine qua non*. He also admitted, that without the Concession, there was no prospect of making a peace now, and that it would cost us a campaign more; this he allowed in justification of those with whom he differed[2]. Mr Grenville replied to Mr Pitt—not very shining, but with firmness and some judgment....[A list of the speakers follows.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 141; N. 246, f. 45.] CLAREMONT, *November 15th*, 1761.

[Expresses his regret at the changed language of the Court of Spain. What were they to do?] With all his faults we shall want Mr Pitt, if such a complicated, such an extensive war is to be

[1] On the Address.

[2] Another account of Pitt's speech, sent to Frederick by the Prussian envoys, is in Schaefer, ii. *b*, 742; and cf. Lord Barrington's account of the debate, N. 246, f. 19; and *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Mrs Stopford-Sackville, i. 86; and Walpole, *George III*, i. 71; for account of debate on the same topic on December 9, H. 4, f. 211.

carried on. I know nobody who can plan or push the execution of any plan agreed upon in the manner Mr Pitt did*....

And this brings me to Mr Pitt's speech in the House of Commons on Friday last. By all I can hear of it, it was very moderate and judicious....I think there was some mischief in it, as his great view was, first, to suppose we must have success this next campaign; and then, that that success must enable us to oblige France to renounce the Fisheries, of either of which I see no probability, and of the last an utter impossibility, in my opinion.

I own, I agree entirely in what Mr Pitt said as to the German war; that that diversion enabled us to make our conquests in America; and the continuation of that diversion alone can, in my poor opinion, preserve them. Mr Pitt also stated very clearly the danger of an invasion from France, if its whole force was at liberty to be made use of against these Kingdoms. What will that do with the addition of the money and strength of Spain? [He could never agree to the abandonment of all Europe, from the Elbe to the Mediterranean into the hands of France, if only from the point of honour.]...

[On November 16, 1761 (N. 246, ff. 59, 234), the Duke writes on the same subject to Sir Joseph Yorke. He had declared to the King and Lord Bute his strong objection, from every point of view, to the abandonment of the continental war, and had received very satisfactory answers....]

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke

[N. 247, f. 123.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *December 11th*, 1761.

[Informs him of the success in the House of Commons, the vote for the German war obtained *nem. con.*, the subscription of the 12 millions for the war and the rejection of the motion to produce the Spanish papers.] Having mentioned your brother [Charles] I must have the pleasure to acquaint you that everybody agrees, and the King told me so himself, that never man spoke (and he spoke very long) with greater ability, force and propriety than he did; and it had the effect proposed upon the audience. He took the question from the beginning, the Russian and Prussian treaties in 1756, refuted all the malicious turns and imputations which Mr Pitt had flung out against the ministers and transactions of those times; defended the measure upon right and solid principles and upon its own bottom, and vindicated the honour, character and reign of my old dear master, which had been most scandalously attacked and traduced by a West India Colonel Barry†....There were

* The D. of N. was very apt to be reacting on the first alarm, but indeed, my Father told me the D. of B[edford] said something like this of Mr Pitt. H.

† My brother made a very good defence of the German measures of the last reign. Mr Pitt thanked him for it, and said he had done justice or honour to the ashes of an injured King. H. [See also D. of N. to the D. of Devonshire (N. 247, f. 149) and Lord

many very personal speeches against Mr Pitt, but none to compare with Col: Barry's, who called him a dangerous profligate and abandoned minister, who had thrust himself into the Closet upon the shoulders of a deluded people, and who, like a camelion, had turned to the colour of the ground upon which he stood. Indeed, such language does not become a House of Parliament[1]....I hope this will incline our enemies to peace. I am as much for it as any one man in Europe; but I am not for making it by halves....

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 17, f. 403.] HAGUE, *December 15th*, 1761.

...What surprised me was...Lord G. Sackville's getting up to talk, of all subjects, upon the German war, and I don't wonder when he did get up that he was of opinion it ought to have ended at Closterseven; happy would it have been for him if that had been the period of the war in Germany....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 247, f. 349.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Christmas Day*, 1761.

MY DEAR LORD,

Your Grace says very truly that the die is cast, and it has certainly been so for some time past[2]; for I am convinced now that nothing would have prevented it but absolutely submitting to the demands of Spain; or else (which would have been the rightest way of all) concluding a peace with France, which was obstructed from more than one quarter....Your Grace says you were against exposing ourselves to this answer by not asking the question. I am very ignorant and I daresay am mistaken, but indeed, my dear Lord, it appears to me that you take the thing very short. It is plain that nothing would have satisfied Spain, especially since this last connexion with France, but beginning with demolishing our

John Cavendish to the Duke of Grafton. "The worthy gentlemen with great places were shamefully cool in vindicating their late Master. At last Charles Yorke did it prodigiously well; he gave the history of the last seven years and vindicated the conduct of the King and his ministers throughout. I think it was the best argumentative speech I ever heard; his manner could not be pleasing." Grafton's *Autobiography*, 36; also H. 4, f. 222; H. 11, f. 320; Walpole, *George III*, i. 87; and *Rockingham Mem.* i. 82.]

[1] Isaac Barré (1726–1802), son of a French refugee; served at Rochefort and Quebec, but was refused advancement by Pitt in 1760; Lieut.-Col. 1761; M.P. for Chipping Wycombe; possessed great oratorical powers especially in invective, now employed against Pitt with great effect, with whom, however, he was in 1764 reconciled. Cf. Walpole's description of the scene, *George III*, i. 94.

[2] f. 345. The Duke did not think the Spanish War inevitable, and blamed Bute for making the demand to see the Compact and for attempting to follow Pitt's methods. See also ff. 362, 443.

establishments on the Mosquito Shore and at Rio Tinto, some of which were made by order or allowance of this government when the Duke of Bedford was Secretary of State. And what English minister or ministers would have ventured to have signed orders for that purpose and for recalling all our subjects from thence, without some further security from Spain? I have seen nobody, nor know anything of Mr Grenville's inclination [to withdraw the army in Germany and employ it against Spain and for the defence of Portugal]; nor do I suppose that his inclination, nor that of any one particular man, will govern this great question. I entirely agree with your Grace that peace is the only true remedy, if it can be attained. I shall also be ready to attend whenever I am summoned....

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 247, f. 367.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *December 26th*, 1761.

...The event is certainly very unfortunate, but upon reflecting back upon all circumstances, I believe it has for some time past been unavoidable; and I am now convinced that the intercepted letter in the summer from Choiseul to D'Havrincourt in cipher, wherein mention was made of training on the negotiation between England and France till the latter end of September, when the Flota should be arrived, deserved more weight to be laid upon it than we were willing to allow it at that time[1]....

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke

[N. 249, f. 13.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *January 26th*, 1762.

...The King spoke to me very kindly and very full of approbation of your letter[2]. Lord Bute did the same, and tho' it has not produced the determination I wished (tho' I did not expect it), it has, however, confirmed his Lordship in his resolution to gain time....I have this day discharged my conscience to my Master. I have implored him not to take this hasty, precipitate step. I have foretold the consequences of it. I have stated his own honour and interest and that of his kingdoms to be essentially concerned. I have told him that all the independent Powers of Europe should, and would, look up to the King of Great Britain for protection

[1] H. 73, f. 46; above, p. 271. The Marquis d'Havrincourt was the French ambassador in Sweden.

[2] Of January 19, to Lord Bute, urging the ill-effects of the abandonment of the "cause of liberty upon the Continent." R. O., S. P., Holland; N. 248, f. 386.

against the United House of Bourbon; that this step once taken, they must despair and fling themselves for their own security into the hands of France, and that this would immediately be the case of the Republic of Holland.

I have talked still stronger to my Lord Bute; and the answer I procured was that that showed how arduous a question it was, for the decision of which he had not yet sufficient light, and that nothing was yet, or should be, without being considered.

The worst is I can't get them to recruit our army in Germany. They say that would be an immediate determination that the troops were not to be recalled....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 249, f. 381.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *February 16th*, 1762.

...I cannot say that I find "the universal opinion is that we have hastily and unnecessarily brought on the Spanish war." There is certainly difference of opinion about it; but many whom I have daily met with think that from the time of the Family Treaty signed, Spain had taken her party, and that the French faction in the Court of Madrid were determined to have the war, tho' possibly they wished to gain a little more time to be better prepared....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 194; N. 250, f. 9.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *February 22nd*, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,...

When I came to Court this morning I found my Lord Bute enraged with the Prussian ministers and extremely displeased with the King of Prussia himself. His Lordship showed me the King of Prussia's long expected and long promised letter to the King, where his Prussian Majesty was to lay his whole thoughts and plan before the King.

Instead of that, the letter was a very short one; one side of quarto paper only, breathing war more than ever; that the present disposition of Russia was the most favourable for the King and himself; that by pushing on the war, the King would decide his command over the seas, and the King and his Prussian Majesty would defeat the greatest combination of Powers against them that ever was known; that the war with Spain was a lucky incident etc. No hint at peace but some general declaration about it, but war was the question. There was at the same time a deciphered intercepted letter from his Prussian Majesty to his ministers wherein he says *totidem verbis*, speaking of the proposals or ideas of the present ministers, that they ought to be sent *à la petite maison, to Bedlam.* This has much hurt us, and indeed, it is a pretty extraordinary return for the assistance which has been given to the King of

Prussia by this country. [The Prussian ministers demanded from Lord Bute the immediate grant of the subsidy of £670,000, *oui ou non.*]...I agreed with my Lord Bute that the King of Prussia's answer was by no means satisfactory and not what we had reason to expect; that there was not one word said of this good disposition in the new Court of Petersburg to bring about a peace[1]...; that I adhered to what I had at first told them, that this event in Russia was happy or otherwise as it might tend to promote peace; that if it was to encourage us to continue the war, it was making the wrong use of it; that therefore I was neither for giving a negative nor affirmative to the subsidy,...that I thought we should wait till we had an answer from Petersburg....I hope your Lordship will not disapprove it. [He had agreed with Lord Bute that a letter should be written to Mitchell, the British minister at Berlin, for the King of Prussia's information, expressing the above views.] The new incident in Russia makes a very great difference. If we don't now get the King of Prussia into a reasonable disposition, to make up with the Empress Queen, we shall engage, as it were, in a new war, or at least upon a new plan....My Lord Bute then asked me very seriously and properly—"Duke of Newcastle, do you think that you can pay and support an army of 70,000 men?"—meaning Prince Ferdinand's army. To which I replied,—"My Lord, if the expense of the support of Portugal does not go beyond what appears at present and there are no other new expenses, I am of opinion, I can support them *for this present year.*"—"But can you another year?"—"That I cannot answer; I answer for no more than this year."—His Lordship seemed very well satisfied with that....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 250, f. 33.]

GROSVENOR SQUARE, *February 23rd*, 1762, in the evening.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am extremely obliged to your Grace for taking the trouble to give me so ample an account of what passed between you and my Lord Bute yesterday, and also with the Prussian ministers....It gives the picture of a very critical and delicate situation, which I must confess to be above my capacity to form an adequate judgment upon. It also furnishes further proofs of what I have long thought, that the inflexibility and *entêtement* of the King of Prussia make him a very difficult and inconvenient ally. Your Grace's account of his letter to the King shows it to be a very improper one after waiting so long for an answer as to his views and plan; and yet, I can easily conceive that this new great event in Russia, the effects whereof are yet uncertain, might

[1] Owing to the recent accession of the Czar Peter.

make so many new ideas crowd in upon his mind that, if he had any plan before (which I doubt), this change might make him continually balancing what new one to form. Undoubtedly, the worst appearance is his breathing nothing but war, and pointing at nothing but conquest without flinging out any notions about peace. As to peace, attended with any sacrifices to be made by him, I never expected anything of that nature from him in his present moments of exultation. He, whom your Grace has found in all his intercepted letters, during the lowest ebb of his fortune, never inclined to part with one foot of territory, could hardly put on so much moderation in the first impressions of this turn, supposed to be in his favour....As to his way of treating the present ministers of this Court, I have already seen so much of that offensive style in the intercepted letters from his Prussian Majesty and his minister Finkenstein, that nothing of that nature surprises me....And I think I have observed that these strokes, together with the many *éloges* bestowed upon Mr Pitt, have done hurt with my Lord Bute. But I have been long convinced that this Prince has done himself much more harm by his pen than ever he has done himself good by it, notwithstanding his excessive vanity of writing. Upon this head he himself deserves *la petite maison.*

[In fairness, however, the King of Prussia can hardly be expected at once to declare his plans in the new circumstances which had arisen. He approves in general of the Duke's reply to the Prussian ministers, but had thought that the subsidy had been already promised and that it was only the mode which was in question. Time, however, sped on, and it must be remembered that the King of Prussia might answer that he could form no plans till he knew whether he should obtain aid from Great Britain. Hesitation also in supporting him might give further encouragement to Austria....He approves greatly the Duke's reply to Lord Bute on the subject of the further financing of the war and advises him strongly to "undertake for nothing."]

[On February 25, 1762 (H. 73, f. 200; N. 250, f. 74), the Duke of Newcastle expresses great doubts to Lord Hardwicke of the expediency of granting the Prussian subsidy at all. Lord Mansfield had declared that the saving of the money might "prevent a bankruptcy." It was suggested that representations might be made to the King of Prussia pointing out that he, by the new turn of events, had two enemies, Russia and Sweden, less and England two more, Spain and the defence of Portugal, and that therefore the subsidy should not be paid. The Duke desires Lord Hardwicke's advice.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 250, f. 76.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *February 25th*, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

Just as I was sitting down to dinner, I received the honour of your Grace's letter, till which I did not apprehend that you entertained the least doubt upon the question *an*, whether the Prussian subsidy should be given at all. I don't pretend to understand politics so well as either my Lord Mansfield or Mr Stone, but I cannot help differing from them upon this point. If a saving of £670,000 could be fairly made to the public without being attended with mischief, it would certainly be the duty of [the] administration to make it, not that I think it would be sufficient to prevent a *bankruptcy*, if that is to be our fate. But one great point with me is that I do not think this subsidy can finally be refused consistently with the King's honour. The granting of the subsidy has been taken as a principle, and we have been disputing with him these two months about the manner of our granting it and his accepting it only; so that the money has been actually or virtually promised. He has now fully agreed to *the mode*, how then can the King, after that, retract the *thing*?

For my own part, I cannot think that this new event in Russia makes any material alteration as to this question. It may possibly deliver the King of Prussia from one enemy, but it is far from certain, perhaps not probable, that it will procure him a man. I therefore much question whether he can support the army, which he now has, for six months, without the aid of this subsidy. If so, that army must be dissolved, and he left to the mercy of the Empress Queen and France.

Besides, if the new Czar should find the King of Prussia deserted or not supported by England, who can tell what change that may make in his way of thinking, or how much more convenient he may think it to make up with the Courts of Vienna and Versailles? Suppose further, that the King of Prussia is his favourite, and his predilection for that prince as strong as my Lord Bute represented it to me this day at noon, who can tell what impression our desertion of the King of Prussia may make upon the Czar's mind and what unfavourable turn it may give him against England, at least so far as to make him suspect, and less disposed to hearken to, the counsels of England to promote a general peace. If his Prussian Majesty has any influence over him, he would not fail upon such a

provocation, to improve it with him to our disadvantage, tho' it might possibly in the event turn to his own prejudice.

Lastly, I cannot help repeating the argument which I mentioned to your Grace before, that the withdrawing of this subsidy will certainly encourage the Empress Queen, who is full as obstinate and as rigid and unreasonable as he, to stand out, and oppose any reasonable terms of peace....

My Lord Bute did me the honour to call upon me when he came from Court, and staid some time...and seemed to be convinced that the subsidy must finally be given, and in that case thought the sooner the better....I...did not enter into much reasoning with him upon it, but rather chose to leave him to pursue his own ideas....

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 250, f. 97.] *February 27th*, 1762.

[Expresses surprise at Lord Bute's change of opinion concerning the subsidy, who now appears to be against it] but we vary from day to day and from hour to hour. [The King of Prussia's replies to the questions asked by the ministers concerning his plans and instructions to his envoy at St Petersburg would be long in coming, and delay was injurious.]

[On March 11, 1762 (H. 73, f. 215 ; N. 250, f. 312), the Duke of Newcastle informs Lord Hardwicke that Lord Bute had announced his intention of introducing a militia bill for Scotland which he, the Duke, had declared his firm intention of opposing.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 250, f. 328.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *March 12th*, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,...

As to the other incident about the Scotch militia, I am equally concerned and surprised at it ; *surprised*, because I think it a very ill-judged part in Lord Bute to suffer himself to be led into a measure contrary to the disposition of much the greater part of the well-affected in Scotland. For my own part, I shall always acknowledge, as becomes me, his Lordship's civilities to me, and shall be sorry to differ from him. But as to this question, nothing

shall induce me to concur in it, or even not to oppose it to the utmost. After having been for great part of my life, busied in disarming the Jacobites in Scotland, I will not, at the conclusion of it, disgrace myself and tarnish my memory (if anybody shall ever think it worth their while to remember me) by contradicting all my past conduct and acquiescing in a measure, which I opposed upon principle about two years ago....I hope Lord Bute will see that it is for his interest and security to stand upon an English support, and that he must be the loser by suffering the Scotch to gain the appearances of too much power over him or with him....

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke to Andrew Mitchell

[Add. 6836, f. 155.] HAGUE, *March 31st*, 1762.

...The Prussian ministers have taken pet at a supposed opening made by us to the Court of Vienna....We have meant to act fairly by H[is] P[russian] M[ajesty]. He kept us ignorant for months together of his situation and sentiments; we all knew that he was at the last gasp, when Spain declared war against us. They thought in England that the Court of Vienna might be awakened to a sense of its interest upon the publication of the *Pacte de Famille* and abate its animosity towards the King of Prussia, if other baits were hung out to her; this too was insinuated to us from other parts.... I was desired to sound at a distance the sentiments of the Court of Vienna, which have appeared as French as ever....H. P. M. has had a strong proof of our friendship by our conduct at Petersburg[1]; and if everybody was as flippant to tell tales, I could perhaps tell some too, tho' I never have for fear of creating a jealousy when a union was necessary[2]....

[On April 2, 1762 (N. 251, f. 310), Lord Hardwicke writes to the Duke of Newcastle on the new conquests in the West Indies, acquisitions of great importance as transferring the sugar trade from France to England, and easily defended as islands by the navy; and suggests, though he gives no opinion of his own, that they may be considered of greater value even than Canada and more worth retaining in the negotiations.]

[On April 10, 1762 (H. 73, f. 234; N. 252, f. 13), the Duke of Newcastle remarks to Lord Hardwicke upon the fixed determination of George Grenville to get rid of the German war* and Prussian

[1] The K. of Prussia's interests had been well represented and forwarded by Keith, the British envoy.

[2] He had informed Bute on March 16, 1762, of the intended secret understanding between Prussia and Russia concerning Holstein. R. O., St. Pap., Holland; see p. 294.

* And of the Duke of Newcastle too. H.

subsidy, and to the apparent sympathy with his views now shown by Lord Bute. He complains of the mystery with which the public business was being conducted....]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 252, f. 103.] RICHMOND, *April 14th*, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

As I had not an opportunity of finishing at St James's on Monday my conversation with my Lord Bute relating to the Prussian subsidy, I determined to make an attempt to see him yesterday morning before I set out for this place. His Lordship was so obliging as to appoint ten o'clock, when I staid with him above an hour. I went through the whole of my reasoning upon the subject, such as it is, and which your Grace has heard by piece-meal at different times. This necessarily took in several things relative to the war in Westphalia and those parts of Germany; tho' possibly, even if that could be dropped, (which at this time I think it cannot be), the predilection and passion, which the new Czar has conceived for the King of Prussia, might make it advisable to give the subsidy for this year.

My Lord Bute heard me out, with the appearance of great attention and without the least interruption; answered with the greatest civility, and allowed that there was much weight in all the arguments which I had used. He then took up the objections which your Grace has heard over and over again, and yet seemed to soften and yield to a certain degree upon those objections, admitting that for the sake of pleasing and securing the Emperor of Russia it might be worth while to give the £670,000, altho' it should have no other effect, were it not for *one objection*, which also went equally or more strongly against the continuance of the German war. I soon found that *one objection* was what made the subject of George Grenville's speech at Lord Egremont's on Thursday, viz: that the making such a vast expense this year would absolutely disable this country from going on with any part of the war the next year, in case peace should not be made sooner; that the expense of the German war together with the Prussian subsidy would run so high that six millions must be carried over to be a burden upon the next year's supplies, and that, at that rate, there could be no going on; that six millions was as much as the whole expense of our maritime and American war against France and

Spain need amount to. Your Grace may be sure that I denied and disputed this proposition, and affirmed that less than ten or eleven millions would not suffice, even upon that contracted plan.

Upon this and the consequences of it we had much calm reasoning pro and con, all of which your Grace is apprized of, and is not material to swell this letter with. But the material part is that, tho' I will neither affirm nor answer for anything, especially as we change so from day to day, he appears to me to feel the difficulties and dangers of absolutely refusing the Prussian subsidy and of putting an immediate end to the German war, and is afraid of disgusting the Czar. Indeed, his Lordship confessed it and did himself use the word that *he felt* these difficulties. This made him resort to the supposed necessity in order to avoid ruin at home, and to the terror of carrying over such a vast load upon the supplies of the next year, which, he said, would vastly exceed that which was brought over from the last year to this, for that the Exchequer Bills could go on no further.

If there is any sincerity in all this, the inference I should make would be, that your Grace should endeavour to show him that this burden to be carried over to the next year's supplies, will not be so enormous nor so much exceed what was carried over from the last year to this, as his Lordship has been taught. I am not financier enough to be able to show this and to clear it up, but your Grace with your friends in the Treasury may do it, if it is to be done at all. This is the point at which he sticks, and if it can be answered, he will be disarmed of his principal weapon, or perhaps, I should rather say that George Grenville would be so disarmed.

I must do Lord Bute the justice to say that he frequently mentioned your Grace with the greatest respect; professed the strongest desire to go on with you, and to see you "so supported and so satisfied as your dignity, age and long service entitled you to"; that he had nothing more at heart. These were his own words. You may be sure that I did not fail on my part to encourage this in the strongest manner, to show the necessity of it; that one way of attaining it was to keep down any indecent attacks and sallies, nor did I omit to say everything that was proper for me upon your Grace's services, merit and good disposition towards his Lordship....

My dearest Lord, ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 238; N. 252, f. 183.] CLAREMONT, *April 17th*, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am to return your Lordship my most sincere thanks for the kindest and the *ablest* letter that I ever had from your Lordship, which I received yesterday. Your goodness to me I always knew, but this instance of it, by your appointment with my Lord Bute and the very able conversation you had with him upon the great public points, and the goodness you showed to me in it was the more agreeable, as it was quite unexpected....

I own I have some gleam of hopes from your Lordship's letter, that my Lord Bute may still depart from his intentions of refusing the Prussian subsidy and putting an end to the German war, but his Lordship is so variable that nothing can be depended upon till it is actually done....

The Duke of Devonshire told him plainly that...his opinion was that the moment the troops were withdrawn from Germany, he should think this country *undone*; for that it would be impossible for any ministers to make an honourable peace, and that Lord Bute must, in that case, not be surprised, if he should desire not to be concerned in making it....

By all this you will see how unsettled and undetermined he [Lord Bute] is. He does not hold the same language two days together. And this is the case towards the end of April, when the armies are going to take the field; our general[1] still here without any orders or knowing whether there is to be a campaign or not. Indeed we shall (if we are not already) be the jest of all Europe....

I send your Lordship my letter yesterday from Joe and mine to him of last night. I find everything is in such confusion that nobody knows what to think or what to say....

I wrote immediately yesterday for the true state of our account for next year, and shall falsify Mr Grenville's report, except I have been most grossly imposed upon....[He laments his hard situation, supported by no one except Lord Hardwicke and the Duke of Devonshire, and opposed and caballed against, even in his own office. How was it possible to go on? In a postscript he sends a paper just received from the Treasury, which supports his own contention and falsifies that of George Grenville regarding the amount of arrears to be carried over to next year[2].]

[1] Lord Granby. [2] N. 252, f. 192.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 252, f. 203.] RICHMOND, *April 18th*, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I did not take my resolution to make an appointment with his Lordship [Lord Bute] till after your Grace had left me, and was prompted to it merely by the nature of our situation and the difficulties which I saw the public and your Grace in particular, as one of its first and best intentioned servants, labour under. I am not so vain as to imagine that anything I could say would have an effect, but *gutta cavat lapidem* and 'tis some comfort to be able to say to oneself *liberavi animam meam*....I began with expressly admitting that, if the *two questions* were to be determined by the present difficulties of this country for money, and *that of the Prussian subsidy* by the late behaviour of the King of Prussia and his ministers towards the King and his ministers, there would be nothing to be said in support of either of the points; but I gave him to understand that I thought *that* a very partial and weak way of considering them; that they were to be determined upon higher and larger principles, and that the eyes of the whole nation and of all Europe were upon the English ministry to see that they made the right advantages of this revolution in Russia.... His Lordship said nothing to me of his suspecting that the King of Prussia *would not accept the subsidy*; nor can I now imagine what he means by it[1]. As to *conditions*, none have been declared *specifically*. General words have been used about concurring with the King in measures of peace, which is very right; but if the Empress Queen will not yield or show any disposition, which has been the case hitherto, how can he do it but by pushing his war against her? The newspapers have talked of his sending a body of troops to strengthen Prince Ferdinand's army; and if the Czar would come into measures that might enable him so to do, that might, for ought I know, be the best *condition* of all; at least it would have the most effect upon France. Your Grace concludes very truly that we are in danger of being the jest of all Europe by irresolution and delay. I have read over all your papers, and like your letter to Joe extremely. It is plain that he is much in the dark and somewhat amazed at what is doing here. [He is afraid that the financial statement procured by the Duke of Newcastle from the Treasury comes too near George Grenville's.]

[1] Bute, on February 26, had promised the subsidy, provided Frederick would employ it in bringing about peace. Adolphus, *George III*, i. 577.

Attorney-General to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 252, f. 390.] *April 27th*, [1762].

My Lord,

I have read over all the papers with care and return them with many thanks. I shall only say in general that I honour your Grace's endeavours to prevent that delay, irresolution and languor which must alienate our allies, wound our honour and throw away the fruits of an expensive war and the hopes of a good peace. I am [etc.]

C. Yorke.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 249; N. 252, f. 450.] *April 30th*, 1762.

My Dearest Lord,

I am sure it is unnecessary for me to make any observations upon what passed this morning, only to return your Lordship my most sincere thanks for the great and able assistance you gave us*.

[He declares his fixed determination not to be overruled by George Grenville in his own office and his intention to resign, in case Grenville's plan of limiting the expenditure should be finally adhered to.]

[In reply, on May 1 (N. 253, f. 10), Lord Hardwicke admits the probable necessity of the Duke's resignation, but begs him] not to bring this to a mere personal point between you, as the Head of the Treasury, and Mr Grenville. 'Tis an unworthy competition[1]. [As for himself he heartily wishes he were settled in quiet at Wimpole.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 253.] Newcastle House, *May 3rd*, 1762.

My Dearest Lord,...

I am under the greatest uneasiness and distress. The affair I think is over. I talked it fully with my Lord Barrington, who wrote a paper to prove it was impossible for the Treasury to go on without a million in addition to that of the vote of credit,...to be voted in the committee of supply for services, the

* This was the Cabinet Council, in which it was determined not to give the Prussian subsidy and to confine the vote of credit to one million. D. of N. was only supported by my Father and that worthy man the D. of Devonshire. Lord Bute, Grenville, Egremont, Granville, Ligonier, Mansfield, *contra*. H.

[1] See also the further letter of the Duke, H. 73, f. 251.

heads of which are to be specified, as [?] fourrage etc. They will not consider that we can't avail ourselves of the saving of the £670,000. That money is not raised, and all we want is to raise one million instead of that £670,000.

I went to Court at one o'clock....When I went into the Closet I told the King, I came to know His Majesty's commands about the message. His Majesty seemed not to understand me. The King then went immediately of his own accord to the vote of credit.—"You will have but a million, my Lord."—"Sir, that will not do. I have discoursed with my Lord Barrington[1], who says we must shut up the Exchequer if we have not more granted,"—and then I gave His Majesty Lord Barrington's paper, which your Lordship will have received before this time. He read, seemed amazed, and talked of my having told him otherwise. I showed him the impossibility, as we could not avail ourselves of the Prussian saving, as that money was not voted. I argued long with His Majesty; told him I should deceive him and the public if I made him believe that one million would do for Portugal, Spain, Germany, America, etc.; and I gave him to understand that I could not undertake it. His Majesty said—"I can't bring myself to ask more than one million."—I said a great many things,...asserting my opinion strongly for the Prussian subsidy and German war for this campaign, but that the continuation of the German war was not the question; that could not be put an end to in this manner. His Majesty persevered and I told him, since that was so, H. M. must put it in a way that his pleasure should be carried into execution, meaning that myself and my Lord Barrington could not. I concluded with desiring him to consider Lord Barrington's paper that I might receive his orders. I saw the Duke of Devonshire who thinks that I should write to Lord Bute and desire that if the King persists, H. M. would employ those who would execute his orders. This being the case, it is most probable that I shall be obliged to resign on Wednesday next. The best friend I have is your Lordship, and therefore beg you will call here this evening. I will not keep you long, but I can't be easy without seeing you; the Duke of Devonshire begged that I would do nothing without seeing you and with that I most readily complied....Your Lordship may come and return as early as you please. I am, my dearest Lord, Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[On May 10, 1762 (H. 73, f. 259), the Duke of Newcastle writes to Lord Hardwicke complaining of Lord Bute's conduct, and especially of his having obtained papers and information from the Treasury without any previous consultation with himself. This indignity he will not acquiesce in, and he has determined to resign.] As to the manner, I would put it upon the last offensive act of overruling, or rather in meddling with the business of my

[1] Formerly Secretary for War, now Chancellor of the Exchequer.

office and engaging my colleagues and my secretary in open opposition to me. This the Duke of Cumberland approves. [He desires his friends not to quit office with him, but that they should continue to act with him as before....They should at least cease to attend the Council.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 253, f. 145.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *May 10th*, 1762.

...I take it for granted that your Grace is absolutely determined to quit your employment but, as to the time and manner of doing it and the reasons to be publicly assigned for it, I beg you would not take a hasty resolution. That concerns the public, especially at this conjuncture, and also your own great character. It deserves mature and cool deliberation; and I must take leave to observe that your letter seems to be writ in some hurry and perturbation. I will freely own, and it is a duty which I owe to your Grace to own, that my humble opinion is, that you must either go into opposition or else absolutely retire from public business. You say that you would have your friends declare, that they will continue to act with you in the same conduct as when you was in business. They must do that, either in opposition to measures or in support of measures, and what is to be the consequence? You may be sure I don't ask this question with regard to myself. I have once quitted with your Grace and am proud of it, and I thank God I have myself nothing now to quit. But this I beg leave to say. I am in my 72nd year, and my intention is absolutely to retire and to live mostly in the country. I am too old and too much tired of the world to act the same part that I did between the times of your Grace's last going out and your coming in again in July 1757. To be hanging about the Court, harkening to the intrigues of it and watching the turns and openings that may play up, as things are now constituted, is what I can by no means undergo; and with regard to yourself, whose ease and honour I would consult as much as my own, it will keep you in perpetual uneasiness, and can end in nothing material at last but opposition....

I am, my dearest Lord, most unfeignedly and affectionately,

Ever yours

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke

[N. 253, f. 239.] Most secret. NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *May 14th*, 1762.

DEAR SIR,...

I shall now, as well as I can, inform you of the many incidents which have happened to induce me (with the advice of my friends the Duke of Devonshire, my Lord Hardwicke, and my Lord Mansfield) to take the resolution, which I have executed, to desire the King's leave to retire, tho' I shall not put it into execution till after the Parliament rises.

After the unhappy motion made by the Duke of Bedford for the immediate recall of the British troops from Germany, which he and others asserted had been absolutely promised them, tho' no particular time was mentioned by the administration (my Lord Bute), I have watched his Lordship narrowly and have always feared that sooner or later, that fatal measure would be taken, which I have endeavoured to stave off by all the management I could. The better to bring this about, an increase of expense, be it ever so little, was objected to, and I dared not propose any for fear of its being turned upon me....On this plan Lord Bute was glad to lay hold of any difficulty or unreasonable demand that was flung in his way, and the ill-judged conduct of the King of Prussia, in the reserve he showed in explaining himself to the King and in concealing his instructions to his minister, Baron Goltz at Petersburg, and many silly and provoking (tho' not altogether undeserved) gross reflections made upon my Lord Bute in all his correspondence with his ministers here, animated his Lordship to be glad of any opportunity to keep the King of Prussia at a distance, in order to have the more pretence to deny the subsidy and by that means to give a fatal blow to the German war.

At last, all these considerations put together determined his Lordship to give an absolute negative to the Prussian subsidy and even to grow cool and indifferent about Russia for being, in his Lordship's opinion, too much attached to the King of Prussia, whom my old friend, my Lord Granville, called the greatest enemy the King had.

This question remained undecided so long that I was at last forced to desire my Lord Bute that the King's servants might have an opportunity of giving their opinion upon a question, which some of them thought of such importance to this Kingdom in the present situation of our affairs.

Accordingly, at a meeting at my Lord President's, where were present my Lord Chancellor, my Lord President, the Duke of Devonshire, the Duke of Newcastle, my Lord Bute, my Lord Hardwicke, my Lord Egremont, my Lord Ligonier, my Lord Mansfield and Mr George Grenville, the Duke of Devonshire, my Lord Hardwicke and myself were most strongly for giving the subsidy and urged such arguments for it as, I may say, were not,

and I think could not be, answered; the chief of which were, the losing all the advantages which the happy turn in Russia has given us, the almost certainty of having such success this campaign as must end in a general good peace; whereas, the refusing the subsidy would make us two more great and considerable enemies, the Czar and the King of Prussia; when the late ungrateful and insolent answer of the Court of Vienna to the friendly insinuations made them by the King, proved there was nothing to be expected from them; and when the loss of Russia and Prussia might prevent the success of our secret negotiation with France, which otherwise might very probably be brought to a happy issue and that soon.

This step taken, I did imagine that the recall of our troops from Germany and the total abandoning of the German war was determined without anything of that sort having been said to me. A most remarkable and offensive transaction soon cleared up this point and showed that the point was determined, if we had not our separate peace with France, before.

I found a popular (as it was thought) preference was to be given to the Portugal war...and the vote of credit, as I apprehended, to be confined to Portugal only. I went on my own way.... Mr Grenville first showed it would interfere with his measure of putting an end to the German war in the middle of the campaign; and my Lord Bute and he determined the King to insist with me, when I proposed the other million, that no more than one million should be asked. I urged the necessity of it; I produced a paper to prove it, but all to no purpose.

In order to defeat me, my Lord Bute and Mr Grenville engaged part of my own Treasury against me, and quoted to me their opinions;...they not only quoted them against me but sent regular questions...and particularly one paper where Martin [the Secretary] is to state the savings that would arise from putting an end to the German war....

After this unprecedented and unbecoming usage to me in my own office, I don't suppose any man of sense and honour can think I should stay in the Treasury....I acquainted my Lord Bute previously with what I intended to say to the King....My Lord Bute was very reserved; never said he was sorry, nor used one single argument to dissuade me from it, but only said *that* would hurt our peace, for my friends would be against the peace; to which I said—"No, My Lord, in employment and out I shall equally be for peace; I like your peace tho' I don't like *your war*,"—meaning his silly maritime war[1]....

From my Lord Bute I went directly to the King, and after having fully explained the treatment I had met with...I took the liberty very fully to show the King that under these circumstances it was impossible for me to be of any service to His Majesty in the Treasury....

[1] *I.e.* the notion of an exclusively maritime war without the continental.

The King was extremely civil and gracious; wished I would reconsider it, which His Majesty often repeated....

The Duke of Devonshire and my Lord Mansfield have talked the affair over with my Lord Bute....His Lordship treated it to them both as a determination of mine; that the thing was over; "the Duke of Newcastle was determined"; and did not give the least handle to either of them to endeavour to make it otherwise; which, as well as his late conduct in everything towards me, shows plainly that it had been *his determination* for some time, and to use me so as to make it impossible for me to continue in employment with ease or honour, or with any utility to the public[1].

This being so, the resolution I have taken must take place upon the rising of the Parliament, which I suppose will be in less than a fortnight. I have made a fair trial for the sake of the King, the public and my friends. Long experience has showed that I can be of no use to either; and I scorn at my age, after forty years service and, I hope, having gained some reputation both abroad and at home, to be walking about Court, an insignificant cipher....

In business, that is foreign business, upon which everything depends, the Duke of Devonshire, my Lord Hardwicke and I only come to Council to be overruled. The Duke of Devonshire has said to my Lord Bute that he will attend Council no longer, that is after I have resigned my employment, and I dare say my Lord Hardwicke will do the same; for the attendance there, in our late circumstances, has been very disagreeable to him for some time.

My Lord Bute's schemes for foreign affairs are very different from ours. Popular maritime expeditions in war and a total dislike of all continental measures, are the basis of his politics. These differences of opinion in essentials make it impossible for us to draw together, even less than with Mr Pitt; for though he had all that popular nonsense about him, he mixed it with real system and backed it with a continental support which had sense in it, if we could have carried on the war for some time upon the foot of such immense expense. My scheme was to make our push this campaign, whatever it might have cost; and I would have carried it on everywhere, whatever might have been the expense; and I would have seen at the end of this campaign what general peace we could then have made; and for this purpose, when the Court of Vienna rejected so haughtily our pacific insinuations, I would have made all the possible use of Russia and Prussia, given the King his subsidy and assisted him wherever I could to advantage. In the meantime, I would have carried on our secret negotiation with France; that would, in my opinion, certainly have succeeded, if the Duke of Choiseul saw we were so strong in Germany; and that

[1] Lord Shelburne goes further and declares that the D. of N. repented of his resignation, and was ready afterwards to "make every sort of submission." *Lord Shelburne's Life*, i. 136; Fox likewise, *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 63–4. But these are hostile and undependable witnesses.

would most certainly have secured a general peace before the end of this campaign.

All these advantages we have flung away....As to our secret negotiation, I will in confidence tell you that it is carried on thro' the channel of the two Sardinian ministers. It at present goes upon the few alterations to be made in the last ultimatum of France last year. We have made some addition on our part on account of Martinico. The Duke of Choiseul seemed very reasonable and there were great hopes of success; what may be the case *now*, I do not know....I must conjure you not to let any creature know that you know the least word of our secret negotiation[1]....

It was certainly determined to drive me out. My great crime was my resolution not to abandon the war in Germany this campaign, and that has drawn this immediate ill-usage upon me with regard to my own office. They think, but in that they may be mistaken, that the abandoning Germany, the King's electoral dominions and our allies in this scandalous manner, will make them popular and those that are on the contrary side of the question the reverse; in that they may be mistaken. The appearances in the House of Commons on Wednesday, upon the proposal of the vote of credit, were far otherwise. I send minutes of what passed there, taken by Mr West. Mr Pitt, without knowing anything of me, spoke upon my plan with regard to the war in Germany and the necessity of a further sum being now given. And I am told by good hands, if my friends had put a question either for that purpose or with regard to the German war, we should have carried it by near two to one. These gentlemen have no very comfortable prospect, if that is the case[2]....

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 10, f. 259.] HAGUE, *May 21st*, 1762.

...My sentiments upon the proper system for England to follow in order to get honourably, safely and speedily out of this cruel war, are the same as your Lordship's. They are founded upon the strongest conviction and (excepting the party at home who are blinded by collateral motives) there is not an informed person either amongst neutrals, allies or enemies, who do not agree with them. If peace is not made before the resolution is taken to dissolve the German army, we shall soon see the fatal consequences of such a measure; and however popularity may appear at present to run against Germany, the contrary will manifest itself as soon as

[1] Count Viri, Sardinian minister in London and the Bailli Solar de Brielle in Paris. Sir J. Yorke in reply (N. 253, f. 378) states, however, that the negotiation was already known to him and also to the Dutch and to the Prussian ambassadors, and in France generally.

[2] See also H. 73, f. 259.

the troops are on their march home. To be sure the King of Prussia has not acted properly towards us; but he was luckily returned by the predilection of the Czar to such a situation as rendered him an ally of consequence instead of a burden, and I am therefore sorry his letters were read, if unguarded expressions against individuals, who sin perhaps in the same way, are likely to produce such national measures as the most powerful at home seem to be contending for. I believe too, that H.P.M. has not been at the bottom averse to peace, even with the loss of the County of Glatz; but he was aware of the implacable hatred of the Empress Queen and afraid to make her more obstinate by appearing forward to treat; but the innocent, tho' secret, insinuation made to Vienna, having been discovered by his ministers at London...it is not surprising [that] that Prince, who is his own minister and a man, should listen a little to his resentment and tease us a little with a reserve when he sent a minister to Petersburg. It is in vain, however, to reason upon all this; the mischief I am afraid is done, and if one speaks out, the cause of it is wholly personal and therefore the remedy more difficult to be found. The effect all this must produce upon the Prussian head of the Czar is the most to be apprehended; for, as your Lordship very justly observes, the empire of Russia is absolutely necessary for us either in peace or war....

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 234.] WIMPOLE, *June 3rd*, 1762.

...I suppose this letter may find you just returned from the sumptuous entertainment of your new Secretary[1]. I have not yet heard that I have had a card from anybody, nor do I regret it....

I shall hope by tomorrow's post to read the King's Speech for the first time....

I...have had three good rides in spite of the sun....

My most affectionate compliments and good wishes wait upon my Lady Grey and my dear pretty grand-daughters, who now stare me in the face from over my chimney.

Believe me always,

Your most affectionate,

HARDWICKE.

[1] George Grenville, now Secretary of State, on the occasion of the King's birthday.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE ADMINISTRATION OF LORD BUTE

LORD BUTE had triumphed. He was immediately appointed First Lord of the Treasury in the room of the Duke of Newcastle and created at the same time a Knight of the Garter. George Grenville succeeded him as Secretary of State; and Sir Francis Dashwood, the founder of the notorious Brotherhood at Medmenham, a chief inventor of the foolish indecencies and blasphemies perpetrated there, and who brought to his office no other qualifications, became Chancellor of the Exchequer. His total ignorance of business and unfitness for his duties, together with Grenville's narrow pedantry and sententiousness, and Lord Bute's own weakness and inexperience, constituted an administration of the most deplorable incapacity; but it was supported by all the authority of the Crown, exercised by violent menaces, and by a flagrant and unexampled system of corruption.

Against such influences only the resistance of a strong, united and organized opposition could avail. But the process of disintegration amongst the Whig leaders was by no means stayed by recent events. They remained as disunited as before; and having resigned office not together but at different times, on different points of public policy, they were separated by jealousies and mutual suspicions which carried their divisions even further and deeper. In later times such disputes would no doubt have been subordinated to the principal aim, and a strong combination would have been formed in the common interest and in self-defence. But the party system, as we now know it, did not then exist, and various cross-currents prevented the formation of two great parties in the state. Instead, a number of small factions, founded mainly on petty and personal questions with separate leaders had sprung up, while a general sentiment of loyalty to the Crown rendered any scheme of systematic opposition distasteful, not only to those who

had passed their lives in the King's service, but also to those who hoped there to find employment.

To Lord Hardwicke, who was generally trusted and esteemed, who alone maintained good relations with all the Whig leaders, and whose influence might perhaps have once more combined them, the notion of any declared opposition to the King's government was highly repugnant. He would only enter opposition unwillingly, with very different feelings from those which moved Fox, or even Pitt, and with a far greater sense of responsibility. After nearly fifty years spent without intermission in the King's service and in support of his measures, he esteemed it beneath his dignity and contrary to his duty, now at the term of life, to associate with any self-seeking or unscrupulous politicians of adventure, or lend the weight of his name to any combination deliberately organized to embarrass and destroy the administration[1]. To join in an attack upon the Throne, or the Hanoverian dynasty, the safeguard of liberty and of the national Church as well as of the whole settlement of the sacred Revolution, was to him, not only a grave political mistake, but a crime; and it was impossible, in the actual circumstances, to attack the government without at the same time attacking the King, who had so imprudently identified himself with the acts of his ministers, and without seriously weakening the royal authority, should the movement prove successful. A wiser course, it seemed, was to suffer for the present the lesser evil, the abuse of the prerogative and the attempt to proscribe the Whig party, and to hope that in time the young King would learn and carry out the duties of a constitutional sovereign. "To the great Whig families," wrote Burke, in 1770, who, living nearer those times, is better able than ourselves to understand their situation and attitude, "it was extremely disagreeable, and seemed almost unnatural, to oppose the administration of a Prince of the House of Brunswick. Day after day they hesitated and doubted and lingered, expecting that other counsels would take place; and were slow to be persuaded that all which had been done by the Cabal was the effect not of humour but of system[2]." Looking back into the past, Lord Hardwicke even regretted the part which he had taken in 1746 in obliging George II to dismiss Lord Granville; and his eldest son tells us that "in his cooler hours he disapproved those resignations[3]." He had

[1] See p. 391.

[2] *Thoughts on the Present Discontents.*

[3] Vol. ii. p. 247 *n.*

promised the old King at that time, never, as long as he lived, to enter into any formal opposition to any administration, and declared "that he would not undergo the slavery nor would he partake in the guilt of it[1]." In 1757, he had rejected altogether the idea of setting up an organised opposition, "the most wicked combinations that men can enter into, worse and more corrupt that any administration that I ever yet saw." He had declared himself then determined to avoid all party engagements and to oppose only particular measures when necessary. "I am sensible that this is not the political way to keep a party together, but that is not an objection against doing what I think in my own conscience to be right[2]."

Two concurrent circumstances alone, in his opinion, could justify such a course, the absolute necessity of opposing a measure fatal to the national interests and liberties and an expectation and prospect of success. None of the incidents which now followed, not even the terms of the inadequate peace which he himself criticised adversely in Parliament, nor the mischievous government of a Favourite, nor the various acts of high-handed and dangerous tyranny which ensued, seemed to him to satisfy the test applied by his judgment[3].

In any case, such an opposition must be that of the whole Whig party. He ridiculed the notion that the Duke of Newcastle and himself, two old men, incapable of fatigue and inexperienced in the arts of opposition, should begin a movement themselves in the Lords, without the assurance of any certain support either from the Whig peers or commoners, and while few showed any desire or intention of abandoning the government.

He had great objections to the alliance and connection now renewed by the Duke of Newcastle with the Duke of Cumberland, a very unfit person, in his estimation, to guide the party. The Prince had maintained a close friendship with Fox till the latter joined Lord Bute, and continued to receive his visits even subsequently. On the Duke of Newcastle's resignation, however, he had written expressing a wish to resume with him his former political relations, and was able soon to boast that *Est-il Permis* was in his library at Windsor Lodge once a fortnight[4].

[1] Vol. i. p. 504. [2] Vol. ii. p. 392.

[3] Below, pp. 415–6, 424–5, 432–6.

[4] A nickname given to the D. of N. who was supposed always to address members of the Royal Family in this fashion. N. 260, f. 382. Below, pp. 390, 401, 433;

No opposition, in Lord Hardwicke's opinion, could have the slightest chance of success, which was not supported by Pitt in the House of Commons and in the country. "All other opposition," wrote Lord Barrington, one of the ministers, "is brutum fulmen[1]." Standing by himself, his eloquence and reputation could make little way against the influence of the Court, but assisted by the Whig leaders in the Lords and by their adherents in the Commons, Pitt must have overcome eventually the "King's Friends," and compelled the King to readmit himself and his party to office. He possessed the experience, which the other Whig leaders lacked, in the art of successful opposition. Opposition was not to Pitt, as Lord Hardwicke described it to the Duke of Newcastle, "an untrodden path to us and a kind of new trade to learn at a late hour[2]." Nor was he deterred by their scruples. But Pitt was now hoping to return to office, not by forcing the King's hand, but through the Sovereign's favour, and was fettered by the connection maintained or renewed with Lord Bute and by his lately acquired peerage and pension. Thus his own attitude, while he approved and encouraged the hostility of others towards the Court, continued to be one of expectancy, inconsistency, uncertainty and hesitation, till the great opportunity passed away of warding off from his country calamities which, in later years, he could only uselessly deplore.

The support given, moreover, by Pitt and his party to the Wilkes agitation, which brought in its train the foolish abuse of the Scots and some popular and mischievous notions of the law, met with Lord Hardwicke's strong disapproval. He could have no sympathy with any opposition to the government which proceeded on these lines; while Pitt's attitude towards parliamentary privilege and the popular judgment delivered by his follower, Sir Charles Pratt, in favour of Wilkes, were directly contrary to his long-settled principles of law and government.

Pitt was here also brought into collision with Charles Yorke, who, as Attorney-General, was in some way responsible for the proceedings against Wilkes, and who shared and supported his Father's opinions; and this difference proved a fatal source of weakness and disunion amongst the Whigs.

Life of Lord Shelburne, i. 157, 164; *Rockingham Mem.* i. 115, 126, 128 sqq., 131; *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 58, 66. According to Lord Barrington (*Life*, 1814, p. 70), "Henceforward all other influence on the Duke of Newcastle ceased; even that of Lord Hardwicke."

[1] *Chatham Corr.* ii. 271.

[2] N. 263, f. 1.

It will be remembered that in 1757, on the formation of the new ministry, the claims, and indeed the rights, of Charles Yorke, then Solicitor-General, had been sacrificed, at the pressing instances of Pitt, to the advancement of Charles Pratt[1]. Not only was he deprived of the customary promotion, but Pratt, who was placed over his head, was his junior at the Bar and far behind him in practice and standing. A man of high character and of respectable attainments, but whose legal career was never independent of political considerations and who was ready to follow Pitt blindly in either House of Parliament, or in the Cabinet, or again as a popular judge to give decisions in accordance with Pitt's notions, Charles Pratt was naturally preferred to Charles Yorke, who had been brought up in his Father's strict legal principles and practice, who was himself too great a man in his own profession to suffer lay interference, and who ridiculed and repudiated Pitt's attempts to dictate on legal procedure. Pratt, moreover, had been a schoolfellow of Pitt's at Eton. The claims of friendship, however, were by no means the chief motive in Pitt's eager advocacy of Pratt's advancement. A friendship also existed between Pitt and Charles Yorke. They had often met as guests of Ralph Allen at Prior Park at Bath, and Charles Yorke was said to have employed his interest formerly with his Father and the Duke of Newcastle to obtain office for Pitt[2]. Indeed, such claims had no great weight with Pitt. "I am much deceived in him," wrote one, who was often in his company and knew him well, William Warburton to Charles Yorke, "if he had ever the least notion of friendship, but as the foundation of a political connection"; a judgment to which the second Lord Hardwicke has added the observation, "I believe this is very true[3]," and which is corroborated by Lord Shelburne, who describes him as "incapable of friendship or of any act which tended to it[4]." The promotion of Pratt had, on the contrary, a definite political aim and motive; and was part of Pitt's general scheme, steadily pursued, and which we have already noticed, of pushing his own power and interest, and of diminishing that of the Duke of Newcastle and of Lord Hardwicke, whose influence in Westminster Hall it was at least hoped to destroy by the exclusion of Charles Yorke from the Woolsack and the Cabinet in Pratt's favour.

Pitt seems to have been pressed into this project by Thomas

[1] Above, vol. ii. pp. 371–2.
[2] *Chatham Corr.* ii. 161.
[3] Egerton MSS. 1952, f. 51.
[4] *Life*, i. 76.

Potter, the abandoned son of the late archbishop of Canterbury, one of that unworthy group of followers, to whose evil influence the less creditable incidents of Pitt's career may perhaps be ascribed, and who has been handed down to fame as the author of the disgraceful *Essay on Woman*, and as the individual who "poisoned Wilkes's morals," and "introduced him to the Jews," whose "coarse and almost obscene" conversation "must have been unpardonably offensive to a lady of Mrs Wilkes's peculiar delicacy[1]." This unsavoury person was accustomed to address Pitt in terms of the most abject adulation, and in return was named by Pitt as "one of the best friends I have in the world," and placed by him in office[2]. "You have done ill," Potter writes to Pitt, "to propose yourself as an example to me. It is as injudicious as to tell a sinner that he must imitate a saint. The impossibility makes him too desperate even to begin the attempt." "The world is peopled with your admirers," he writes on another occasion, "but I have long been your lover." "I do not aspire to be your Right Hand but I lay claim to the honour of being your Footstool[3]." The same Potter wrote to Charles Yorke, in 1754, affecting great disappointment at Lord Hardwicke's decision not to appoint him at that time to the post of Solicitor-General, adding "I repine at the rigid virtue of the Roman father[4]." On October 17, 1756, he wrote to Pitt, "If anything should take place, think of Pratt for Attorney. If you have the lead in the House of Commons, 'tis fit you should have at your elbow a lawyer of your own....Nothing would vex or lower the insolence of the Lord Chancellor more, and it would bring away the dependence of Westminster Hall[5]."

The same month Lord Hardwicke consented reluctantly to the admission of Pratt into the House of Commons at the instance of the Duke of Newcastle, at the same time offering him the second justiceship of Chester, an appointment which would have withdrawn him to some extent from the principal scene and which Pratt, now with one foot on the ladder, not unnaturally declined[6].

[1] *Wilkes Corr.* i. 18, 35.

[2] *Chatham Corr.* i. 173.

[3] Chatham MSS. 53.

[4] H. 285, f. 356 and C. Y.'s reply, f. 358; an attempt seems to have been made, even as early as this, to push Pratt into the place of Attorney-General, *Hist. MSS. Comm.* Rep. viii. 225.

[5] *Chatham Corr.* i. 179. See also Legge to Pitt to the same effect, *ib.* 167.

[6] Vol. ii. pp. 309–11, 315–8. According to Lord Campbell (*Lives of the Chancellors*, v. 238, 357), "on the authority of Sir James Mansfield from the relation of [Pratt, then] Lord Camden himself," Lord H. is said to have treated the latter with much disregard

It was in June 1757 that a step was taken, which had results of so far-reaching and fatal a character, when Lord Hardwicke, in order to bring in Pitt and establish the new administration, gave way to the latter's demand and allowed Pratt to be promoted over his son's head to the Attorney-Generalship. "In this affair," wrote the second Lord Hardwicke, "my Father acted rather too disinterestedly, for there was not the shadow of a pretence to put Pratt before my Brother[1]." This was the rift within the lute, which ever henceforth widened and increased the disunion in the Whig party, the flaw in a great and brilliant career, fated from that moment to close in gloom and catastrophe.

The two rivals, nevertheless, worked together in union, maintaining friendly and even affectionate relations till the political intrigues and ambitions of others separated them asunder. Charles Yorke undertook the greater part of the important official duties which properly belonged to the office of Attorney-General, especially in the matter of reports, Pratt deferring to his legal experience and accepting his assistance with characteristic good humour and without any feeling of jealousy or uneasiness[2]. At length an opportunity occurred for rectifying the injustice done to Charles Yorke. After the retirement of Pitt, Bute found the presence in the government of so faithful a follower of the former as Pratt inconvenient, and on the death of Chief Justice Willes Pratt was compelled, much against his inclination and "not without shuddering" at his "banishment," to accept the vacant judgeship in the Common Pleas, and to retire from the administration and from Parliament[3]. Charles Yorke then succeeded as Attorney-General, "a situation," wrote Lord Bute to him, "to which you had formerly the justest pretensions, that were waived with a moderation and public spirit that did you great honour, all which the King is well acquainted with[4]." The direct

and refused to listen to him in court. This is so totally opposed to all that is known of Lord H.'s practice and character that extremely good and direct authority is necessary to establish it. Lord Camden's anecdotes, moreover, are not always to be depended on, *e.g.* his story of Lord Bute's taking bribes to conclude the Peace of Paris. Lord H. himself writes to the D. of N. "I love Pratt and have been very much his friend."

[1] See vol. ii. p. 410 *n.*

[2] See *e.g.* Pratt's letter to C. Y. of August 28, 1757 signed, "yours most affectionately," and thanking him for legal assistance (H. 287, f. 38), and another, of August 19, 1760, thanking him for a report—"they are much better than my own," and begging him to pay him a visit at Chislehurst where "we won't talk one word about business" (f. 423); H. 288, f. 5; H. 80, f. 84; also vol. ii. 572, and below, p. 504.

[3] H. 75, f. 274; Walpole's *George III*, i. 99; Chatham MSS. 25, Pratt to Pitt, December 7, 1762; N. 247, ff. 194, 226, 238, 278, 400.

[4] H. 82, f. 207.

prospect of the Woolsack was now once more opened before him, to which he had unquestionable hereditary claims, not by the mere fact of his birth but by the transmission to him of his Father's genius, claims not only assumed in the family or friendly circle but recognised by the Bar and by the general public, and which Pitt's partiality for Pratt and his return to power alone could disturb or obstruct. In August 1762, indeed, he was actually named by the King as the successor on the Woolsack to Lord Henley, who had desired to retire on account of ill-health[1]. "Personally, and in a mere family light," wrote the second Lord Hardwicke, "we have no reason to complain of Lord B[ute], and of Lord Chatham a great deal[2]."

Thus private considerations were mixed with public, and together created what proved at length to be an impassable barrier between Pitt and Lord Hardwicke's family, and which destroyed all prospect of an effectual opposition. Moreover, Lord Hardwicke's sons were by no means bound by the same ties and obligations to the Duke of Newcastle as their Father, and did not feel themselves obliged to accept his leadership or follow his fortunes. Sir Joseph Yorke owed his advancement to his Father's support and his own abilities, and was under no obligation to the Duke, who had seemed to abandon him at a critical moment of his career. Charles was attached to the Duke entirely through his Father, showed himself by no means an enthusiastic follower and excused himself as often as possible from the conferences and conversations at Claremont on the plea of business. Writing to his brother, Lord Royston, on the occasion of one of these irksome visits, he hopes, "that your Lordship will have weight and decision enough to deliver me from the slavery of eating a neck of roasted mutton with the Duchess of Newcastle at one o'clock in the morning[3]." On the other hand he had, together with his brothers, been well received by the young King, and had been distinguished by assurances of favour and support. In his case, as in that of Sir Joseph, professional duties and interests removed him out of the ordinary run of domestic and party politics. Though there was much to regret in the manner in which public affairs were now conducted, there was nothing to compel, except from strictly party motives, the resignation of a principal law-officer of the crown, of a minister abroad, of a cabinet counsellor without office, or of a Lord of Trade, such as Lord Hardwicke's sons, or of a distinguished military officer such as

[1] pp. 408 sqq.; N. 260, f. 60.
[2] H. 4, f. 336.
[3] H. 13, f. 57.

Lord Granby, who on his return to England, in January 1763, showed the same dislike of meddling with political opposition[1]. These circumstances were fully recognized by Lord Hardwicke. Replying to the Duke of Newcastle, who pressed him to use his influence to secure his sons' support for his party, on November 15, 1762, he pointed out that any effectual system of opposition had been rendered almost impossible by Pitt's attitude and that his sons were all men of sense and honour to whom, in the circumstances, he would not dictate their decision or course of conduct[2].

Meanwhile, the superiority of the British forces had been everywhere decisive and victory continued to follow victory. Havannah, the most important of the Spanish West Indian possessions, was taken on August 12, 1762, and Manila, with the whole of the Philippines, on October 6. In addition, an enormous amount of Spanish treasure, amounting to several millions, was captured. The King of Prussia profited by the new turn in his fortunes, and the Austrians were defeated at Burkersdorf on July 21, 1762, obliged to surrender Schweidnitz on October 9, and driven out of Silesia; while Prince Henry gained a great victory over them at Freiburg on October 29. The French were defeated by Prince Ferdinand at Wilhelmsthal on June 24, and next month expelled from Cassel and Göttingen. In Portugal, the Spanish were driven back across the frontier with the help of 8000 British troops.

These glorious triumphs, however, could not stir the mean soul of Bute or extend his view beyond the narrow compass of domestic politics and party interest. They came, indeed, as evil tidings, as an interruption to the conclusion of the peace, as new obstacles to the negotiations and to the wholesale surrenders contemplated. The King in his Speech, on November 25, 1762, was made to say, "I found on my accession to the throne these my kingdoms engaged in a bloody and expensive war," the very phrase to which Pitt had objected in 1760, and no allusion was made by Bute whatever to its glories and triumphs[3]. The capture of Havannah embarrassed him. The rest of the Cabinet, headed by George Grenville, insisted on an equivalent for its surrender and threatened to call in the Whig Lords to the Cabinet to support their views. Lord Bute wished it had come later when all had been finished. He "copied the Treaty

[1] H. 10, f. 373. [2] p. 433.
[3] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1231.

of Utrecht throughout[1]." The victories of Prince Ferdinand over the French, especially, interfered with his plans[2]. The Prince was treated without the slightest consideration; the supplies of his army were obstructed and cabals and calumnies were encouraged against him[3]. Indeed Lord Bute openly called the Brunswick family his "personal enemies[4]." At the close of the war no reward was given and no recognition shown to Prince Ferdinand for his great services; and the Hereditary Prince of Brunswick, when he visited England on the occasion of his marriage to the King's sister, Princess Augusta, was received with slighting coldness. He was asked almost immediately upon his arrival, "When do you go?" "No show or gaiety," writes the second Lord Hardwicke, "was displayed at the wedding and they were sent away in a storm[5]"; and the neglect of the Court was rendered more conspicuous by the enthusiasm of the people, which accompanied him whenever he appeared in public[6]. Lord Bute even took the step—an act of treachery and even treason—of addressing a confidential letter to Choiseul, in which he expressed his vexation at the victory of Wilhelmsthal and urged the French minister to offer a strong resistance to the Prince's army in order that he, the First Minister of the English Crown, might not be destroyed by the Prussian party in England[7].

Fearful indeed that the prospect of peace was receding and that the Parliament would oppose him, he endeavoured to renew good relations with the ministers whom he had excluded from the Cabinet. In August proposals were made to the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke to return to the administration; they might chose any place except the Treasury, and the King would be guided by their advice on the great subject of the peace[8]. Charles Yorke was named as Lord Henley's successor to the Woolsack[9]. Similar

[1] pp. 418–9; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 130–3.

[2] Below, pp. 398 sqq.

[3] Below, pp. 397–400; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 573 sqq.

[4] Below, p. 400.

[5] H. 10, f. 378; Walpole's *George III*, i. 275 sqq.; *Letters*, v. 440, 453.

[6] See Sir J. Y.'s history of the marriage, H. 10, f. 394, who gave the illustrious couple a magnificent entertainment on their arrival at the Hague.

[7] Schaefer, ii. *b*, 552. The explanations supplied by Herr v. Ruville (*Pitt*, iii. 76) that "Choiseul was even then rather an ally than an enemy and that Prussia was rather an enemy than an ally," do not appear to be well-founded or to diminish in any way the criminal folly of this act. See also *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxii. 319.

[8] pp. 402 sqq. *Grenville Papers*, i. 474 sqq.; *Lord Barrington's Life* (1814), 70; cf. also *Rockingham Mem.* i. 131.

[9] Above, p. 367.

offers were also made to Pitt. Lord Hardwicke was consulted once more on the negotiations and public business[1], while at the beginning of September 1762, the King discussed the terms of peace with the Duke of Newcastle, and endeavoured to gain his support[2].

Frustrated in the project of obtaining the assistance of the Whig leaders singly, Bute now turned to the able but unprincipled Fox. The King had declared, "We must call in bad men to govern bad men[3]." Fox, while retaining his lucrative office of Paymaster of the Forces and receiving in addition the promise of a peerage, was accordingly given the leadership of the House of Commons in the place of George Grenville, who had begun to raise objections to Bute's methods of negotiating, who shrank from defending the unpopular measure of the peace in the House of Commons and who could not "stand Mr Pitt's fire there[4]." His office also of Secretary of State was transferred to Lord Halifax and he was relegated to the Admiralty.

Thus fortified, a very different conduct was adopted. Following the counsels of Fox and of such persons as Bubb Dodington, Bute announced his abandonment of a "generous" attitude which might be ascribed to "timidity"; and declared that "the King's situation, the perilous condition of the country, the insolence of faction demand[ed] a rougher vein[5]." Recourse was now had to the arts of intimidation and corruption. Fox joined the government on October 13[6], and the first sign of the new policy was the extraordinary incident of October 28, when the Duke of Devonshire, the last of the Whig peers to remain in office, and a man of the highest character and of conspicuous moderation, who, however, had ceased to attend the Cabinet meetings and had determined to resign, was expelled from his office of Lord Chamberlain with every mark of insult, his name being erased a few days afterwards from the books of the Privy

[1] Below, pp. 392 sqq.

[2] Below, p. 413.

[3] *Grenville Papers*, i. 452.

[4] Below, pp. 422–3; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 134; H. 13, f. 5; N. 255, f. 164; Walpole, *Letters*, v. 263; *Grenville Papers*, i. 450 sqq., 482 sqq.; *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 154 sqq., 189; *Rockingham Mem.* i. 129; Almon's *Anecdotes of Chatham*, i. 388.

[5] Bute to Shelburne, *Shelburne's Life*, i. 165, 180. Bubb Dodington had written to Bute, "I do not understand that men of that rank [of the City] are to demand reasons of measures, whilst they are under His Majesty's consideration. As to you, my dear Lord, I am sure you may laugh at them, and know that the moment they are threatened with the King's displeasure, those that were at your throat will be at your feet." Seward's *Anecdotes* (1804), ii. 372.

[6] *Chatham Corr.* ii. 181; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 133 sqq.; *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 153 sqq.

Council by the King's own hand[1]. He was followed into retirement by Lord Rockingham, by Lord Kinnoull and by some members of his own family, but not by the general body of the Whigs[2]. Moreover, Pitt, who, early in November, had expressed the greatest indignation at the conduct of the government and his desire to see an opposition headed by the Duke of Newcastle, soon showed that he intended to take no active part in it himself and rejected the latter's advances[3]. He "affected to be a chief without a party, and the party without him had no other chief[4]." In his great speech against the Preliminaries of Peace in the House of Commons, on December 9, 1762, following the standard of political conduct set up by the Court, he expressly declared that "he was unconnected and followed no party[5]"; that he was, and wished to be, alone, and came to the House of Commons only to give his personal and individual opinion[6]. "Mr Pitt's conduct," wrote Sir Joseph Yorke, "is as like him as possible, and to him I impute all the confusion that has happened amongst us; for had he had a less ungovernable temper, the peace might have been made under better auspices, and all the disagreeable things that have happened since been avoided[7]."

In these circumstances, Lord Hardwicke deprecated any open or organised opposition, such as was now desired by the Duke of Newcastle, and supported his son, the Attorney-General, in his reluctance to throw up his office[8]. During a visit which the Duke had paid him at Wimpole in September, he had laid it down explicitly, and the Duke had fully agreed, that without Pitt an opposition was hopeless[9]. Considerable interest was taken in the attitude which Lord Hardwicke would finally adopt. "The Duke of Newcastle," wrote Walpole, "certainly goes into opposition. Lord Hardwicke, it is said, will accompany him—if he does, I shall not think Lord Bute's game so sure; that is, I have no notion of Yorkes in opposition without a moral assurance of success. If the *man* Hardwicke comes out of the weather-house, it will certainly be a stormy season[10]." When, however, he consented at last to take

[1] Below, pp. 428 sqq.; N. 258, f. 48; N. 259, f. 273; Walpole's *George III*, i. 158; *Letters*, v. 271 sqq.; *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 176 sqq.

[2] Below, p. 432; *Lord Barrington's Life*, 82.

[3] pp. 430–1; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 195; N. 260, ff. 54, 83.

[4] Walpole's *George III*, i. 174.

[5] *Ib.* 181.

[6] Schaefer, ii. *b*, 643 *n.*, giving the account of Nivernais, the French Ambassador.

[7] H. 18, f. 226.

[8] Below, p. 416.

[9] Below, pp. 415–6, 423.

[10] *Letters*, v. 274.

part in the opposition to the Preliminaries of Peace in the Lords, it was from very different motives, against his own judgment, with a conviction of the inutility of the step, and induced solely by his ancient friendship with the Duke of Newcastle, in deference to the latter's urgent wishes and those of the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Rockingham[1].

"By midsummer 1762," the second Lord Hardwicke writes[2], "our family had lost all favour at Court; my Father was left out of the Cabinet Council on the Duke of Newcastle's resignation, without having it left to his option; my brothers, indeed, remained in their employments, but it was understood, with regard to the two at home, that their continuance was only present and till it was seen more clearly what turn things would take. On the Duke of Devonshire's angry dismission in November, the Duke of Newcastle, strongly connected with the Duke of Cumberland, and in some measure with Mr Pitt, began a warm opposition to the Peace and to all the neglect which ensued. The consequence was that most of his friends, in and out of Parliament, were turned out, and of course his Grace became more exasperated and his followers more violent in their parliamentary conduct. My Father was unwillingly drawn into this opposition, tho' he disliked the ascendant of a Scotch sole minister and favourite as much as anybody. He said to me once, 'that with regard to making a bustle in Parliament, he was too old for it; *non eadem est mens non animus.* He wished to be quiet the remainder of his days, and was not formed for that method of work which opposition requires.' He spoke, however, in the course of that session against the Preliminaries with dignity and force...."

The debate in the Lords took place on December 9, 1762, when Lord Hardwicke made a strong attack on the terms of the Peace. He rose immediately after Lord Bute, and began by deploring the methods adopted by the government, and by expressing his regret that their hasty and rash proceedings precluded unanimous approval and support. He testified to the King's good intentions and proceeded: "It is not unknown to several of your Lordships, who hear me, that I have been a party to many, very many considerations upon this subject. I never declined giving my opinion with freedom and integrity in another place; neither will I decline it now in this House, the only place at present left to me to give such an opinion in. So far as I then went, I have seen no reason to change my opinion, weak as it was; and in what I shall say or do here, I shall

[1] Below, pp. 436, 449; Add. MSS. 6834, f. 41. The statements in Walpole (*George III*, i. 174) and in Mason's *Works of Thomas Gray* (1807), ii. 181, of Lord H.'s and N.'s approval of the Peace, probably from the same source, are nowhere corroborated.

[2] H. 80, f. 5.

not contradict myself."—He then reviewed the Treaty in detail, reflecting upon the numerous gains of territory and advantages now given up without equivalent, and calling attention to the capture of the whole of the French sugar islands except St Domingo, to the important conquest of Havannah from Spain—here he has noted :—"stop a little and do justice to Lord Anson," whose project this was—and to the recovery of all the King's dominions and those of his allies in Germany. He criticised especially the article relating to the King of Prussia, and pointed out that the seeming restitution of the French conquests was none in reality, and indeed nothing but a farce; since the places might be restored by France to Austria or to Saxony, actually in her pay[1]. This was an infringement of the general guarantee of the King of Prussia's dominions as laid down in the third article of the Treaty of 1756[2], which was still in force. He continued: "Upon this part a general and very melancholy observation arises. By this desertion of the King of Prussia, we are left without any system or connection at all upon the continent[3]. The Court of Vienna remains in the hands of France. The King of Prussia, thrown off from us by our own act. All the improvement of the change in Russia—to form a system in conjunction with these two Powers, has been totally neglected. Nobody more averse than I am to Great Britain, mixing voluntarily, or wantonly, or unnecessarily, in the affairs of the continent. But it is absurd and a solecism in politics, to say that a commercial country, a nation of such extensive and universal commerce, as this is, can subsist without some system, greater or less, upon the continent of Europe." He concluded by urging their Lordships to refuse their approbation of the preliminary articles; for by so doing, they would strengthen the hands of the ministers in concluding the definitive treaty. All courts knew that an English ministry treated with them subject to parliamentary criticism.—"This is a shield of defence to them against many demands, as well as a weapon in their hands to enforce others. If they are able to

[1] To this Bute was quite ready to agree, but the places were eventually secured to Frederick by agreement between Prussia, France and England, Lord Halifax receiving F.'s warm thanks, who regarded the support of England as a fresh instance of the King's friendship. The agreement, however, became unnecessary by the Treaty of Hubertsburg made by Frederick himself with Austria. H. 4, f. 358; Schaefer, ii. *b*, 655–9; *Pol. Corr. F.'s*, xxii. 426, 429, 443, 453, 483, 491, 532; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 90.

[2] Treaty of Westminster, above, vol. ii. p. 274.

[3] Cf. Burke ("Observations on a Late Publication," *Works* (1852), iii. 26), "They disgusted (how justly or unjustly matters not) every ally we had; and from that time to this we stand friendless in Europe."

say, 'We cannot do this or that; the Parliament will not support us,'...[the foreign] Power will feel the necessity a British ministry is under, and know they are in earnest[1]."

His speech, however, had little practical effect. Other influences than reason and wisdom now moved the Lords, and the Preliminaries were approved without a division. "I did miss a scene," Walpole writes, "that would have pleased me. The Chancellor [Lord Henley] abused the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke unmercifully, though the latter moves mighty slowly towards opposition, and counts his purse over at every step. So oft I have seen unbounded subservience to those two men in the House of Lords, that it would have pleased me to have been witness of their defeat on the same spot[2]."

The definitive Peace was signed on February 10, 1763, and, as is well-known, proved to be one advantageous to Great Britain, if considered absolutely, but if relatively to the numerous and splendid conquests from the enemy, miserably inadequate. With the exception of Minorca, which in all probability would have been recaptured, France and Spain had nothing with which to effect the so-called exchanges[3]. Gorée with its command of the slave trade, Guadeloupe, St Lucia with its splendid harbour, Martinique, the most valuable of all the islands, were restored as free gifts[4]. Havannah may also be included in the list, for Florida was a poor equivalent for this extremely important conquest, and was only obtained by George Grenville's and Lord Egremont's firmness, so eager was Bute to make peace at any price. Manila was restored to Spain, without the smallest compensation, under the clause which ensured the restitution of all conquests subsequent to the Peace[5]. The French also received back their trading settlements in India, held by them before 1749, and retained their Fisheries. The relief from the burden of the uncertain German war was a

[1] Lord H.'s notes printed in *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1251.

[2] *Letters*, v. 284; below, p. 435. According to Walpole (*George III*, i. 176), Lord H. declared in his speech that the Preliminaries were worse than those which could have been obtained the last year, "and reflected on the assiduity with which prerogative was cried up, more than it had been by the most ductile parliaments." There is no trace of such expressions in his notes and the last sentence is not at all in his style.

[3] Below, pp. 417, 437–8.

[4] See Rodney's letter to G. Grenville of December 4, 1762, explaining the value of these possessions, *Grenville Papers*, ii. 9.

[5] pp. 368, 411–4, 418 sqq.; *Grenville Papers*, i. 450, 480 sqq., 492; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 130 sqq.; *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 69.

considerable advantage, and the termination of the Prussian subsidy was fully justified; but the manner in which the alliance was broken off was unworthy and ignoble. A great opportunity, moreover, of effecting an understanding with Prussia and Russia and of establishing a solid European system, with Great Britain as the predominating partner, which would have secured the peace, was deliberately sacrificed to petty domestic and personal interests[1]. The whole foreign system which had been built up and maintained with such care and wisdom in the last reign, as Lord Hardwicke pointed out, was shattered and destroyed, and the ruin of British prestige and the total loss of influence and allies in Europe had, as is well known, a few years later fatal consequences. Such was the peace which the King described as "greater than we could have hoped for[2]."

In internal affairs Lord Hardwicke's warnings and fears were no less justified. His opposition to the Preliminaries in the Lords had served no useful purpose and had met with little support. Pitt refused all assistance, and in the House of Commons, in the debate which took place on the same day, while attacking the Peace, took care to repudiate, as we have seen, any connection with any party, and left the House without voting, conduct which discouraged and disorganised the opposition[3]. "I find," wrote Lady Temple to her husband, "there are people that think, if Mr Pitt had not said he was a single man, Charles Townshend *cum multis aliis* would never have voted for the Peace, and that it was impolitic to make that declaration, when there was no occasion for it[4]." Charles Yorke followed the same course and example. He "spoke in commendation of several parts of the Treaty, and pointed out many others as the Fishery, East Indies, etc., which he hoped would be amended in the Definitive Treaty and could not give his assent to the Address on the whole, tho' he did not mean to divide the House, nor would he divide upon it, and soon after went away[5]." His brother John also left the House without voting. Lord Royston, contrary to expectation and much to his Father's

[1] Below, p. 406.

[2] *Bedford Corr.* iii. 199.

[3] Below, pp. 447, 454; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 186; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1259 sqq.; Walpole's *George III*, i. 176 sqq., whose description of Pitt's dramatic appearance in the House is one of the most vivid passages in his memoirs.

[4] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 22.

[5] West's account, N. 260, f. 266; *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Marquis of Lothian, 245; Add. 6834, f. 41; cf. also H. Walpole's conduct, *George III*, i. 167.

vexation, actually voted in the majority for the Peace. "Many of the opposition," the Duke of Grafton states, left the House without voting, "as it was given out that there would be no division," and those that remained and voted complained that they had been deserted[1]. "The several disagreeable incidents in the House of Commons," wrote Lord Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle, "have given me a great deal of uneasiness, but I fear there has been very bad mismanagement there[2]." The government, in consequence of the confusion in the ranks of their opponents, obtained large majorities, recording 227 votes for their policy to 63, and in the final division 319 to 65[3].

In these circumstances it is not surprising that the Duke of Newcastle showed signs of jealousy and exasperation. He was too restless and impatient to follow Lord Hardwicke's example and view the situation with the same philosophical calmness and detachment[4]. At this time of trouble and distress the cold negative counsels of acquiescence and indifference, which he now received, seemed incompatible with that great friendship which had lasted nearly 50 years and in which he had so often found strong and generous support. At last, on December 19, 1762, his bitter and pent up feelings found expression in a letter to Lord Hardwicke, in which the chief blame for the misfortunes which had occurred was thrown on the latter and on his family, and every man, who remained in office, was abjured as no longer "a true friend[5]." These "stinging reproaches," to use Lord Hardwicke's own expression, were easily shown to be undeserved by appealing to the counsel which he had consistently given to the Duke, and especially to his advice at the opening of the new reign, and again on his last resignation, to retire altogether from public affairs and leave the field of contention to younger men[6]. Moreover, the Duke himself had frequently repudiated any intention of entering into an opposition, and at the time of his resignation had not called upon his supporters to quit their offices, but to continue only to act with him[7]. Lord Hardwicke had

[1] Lord Royston had become disgusted with the extreme war party and at the waste of so many opportunities of ending the war. Below, pp. 441–50; H. 4, f. 358; Grafton's *Autobiography*, 24.

[2] N. 260, f. 272.

[3] Walpole's *Letters*, v. 283.

[4] Below, pp. 426 sqq.; N. 254, ff. 155, 407.

[5] Below, pp. 439–50.

[6] Above, pp. 261, 361 sqq., and below, pp. 390–1, 420–2, 432–4, 443–4, 449, 512.

[7] Lord Barrington, *e.g.*, a strong adherent of the D. of N.'s, now Treasurer of the Navy, had offered at first to retire with him but had been told not to take that step and was now, in November, unwilling. *Life* (1814), 73 sqq.

then pointed out the impracticability of such an arrangement; that there was no half-way and only two courses open, either complete retirement or active opposition[1]. At the same time he had declared his own choice to be the former. He was too old, he insisted, for the part which he had acted in 1757 and for watching intrigues and catching whispers at Court, and such conduct would not be compatible with his or the Duke's own honour and credit[2].

He, nevertheless, on the present occasion, responded in a tone of affectionate sympathy, avoided useless recriminations and justifications; and the Duke's distress and reproaches wrought so far upon his conscience, always exceedingly tender on the subject of obligation, as to move him to join in opposition to some measures of the ministers of which he disapproved, though refusing still to unite in any organised system of hostility, or to insist at present upon the resignation of his sons[3].

The weakness of the opposition had, however, now been fully exposed. Lord Bute and Fox, than whom "no one knew better the weakness and wickedness of mankind[4]," or how to employ them to the best advantage, were encouraged to carry their system of intimidation and corruption to the last extremities[5]. Within a few weeks followed a wholesale proscription of all the Duke of Newcastle's adherents. He himself was summarily deprived of his three Lord Lieutenancies, as were also the Duke of Grafton and Lord Rockingham, while the Duke of Devonshire, whom it was sought to distinguish by an act of grace from the other Lords, voluntarily resigned his Lord Lieutenancy of Derbyshire[6]. The vengeance and malice of the ministers extended down to the Duke of Newcastle's humblest followers. Many families suffered unmerited hardships and distress. Clerks, schoolboys, widows, servants and old pensioners, all who owed him any obligations, were hunted out and violently deprived of their subsistence, and their places largely filled up by Fox's own relations and dependents. According to a *bon mot* of the time, everyone without exception was to be turned out that the Duke of Newcastle had brought in,

[1] "It is immaterial to ruminate on such old stories now," writes the second Lord Hardwicke, "but the D. of N., when he quitted, should either have got his friends to resign too or retired absolutely like Lord T[ownshen]d." H. 73, f. 260.

[2] pp. 354, 424.

[3] pp. 437 sqq., 454 sqq., 512.

[4] p. 426.

[5] p. 439; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 170.

[6] pp. 447 sqq.; H. 249, f. 239; H. 74, ff. 184, 204; *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 181; *Rockingham Mem.* i. 158.

save the King himself. An attempt was even made by Fox to interfere in the places held by patent but he was obliged to desist owing to the representations of the Lord Chancellor and the law officers[1]. Spies were employed to listen to the conversation in the Coffee Houses and denounce delinquents, and a "reign of terror" was instituted. The Duke of Newcastle writes to Lord Hardwicke that, according to Lord Rockingham, "people are everywhere so cowed and intimidated by these acts of violence and the apprehension of still greater, that no man dares now say one word in the Coffee Houses; that if anything is mentioned, they are silent, go into little companies and cabals in the Coffee Room, but not one word said publicly against them." It was as bad as James II's time[2]. On the other hand, besides threats and punishments, enormous bribes of the most glaring kind were distributed, and honour and decency in public business sank lower than at any time since the Revolution. "A shop was publicly opened at the Pay Office," writes Walpole, "whither the members [of Parliament] flocked and received the wages of their venality in bank bills, even to so low a sum as two hundred pounds for their vote on the treaty. Twenty-five thousand pounds, as Martin, Secretary of the Treasury, afterwards owned, were issued in one morning, and in a single fortnight a vast majority was purchased to approve the peace[3]." These statements are supported by other writers, and in some degree corroborated by the fact that the sum of £41,000, was allotted to Martin, between October 25, 1762 and 1763, while the whole sum paid for secret service was enormously increased during Lord Bute's administration[4]. The number of the Lords of the Bedchamber was augmented from 12 to 22[5]. The new loan of £3,500,000, by means

[1] Below, pp. 439 sqq.; N. 260, f. 424; Walpole, *George III*, i. 184–7; *Letters*, v. 283; *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 179, 184; *Autobiography of the Duke of Grafton*, 20, by whom the victims were reinstated on his accession to office in 1765; *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Earl of Onslow, 521.

[2] H. 74, f. 185; H. 51, f. 294; N. 261, f. 194.

[3] *George III*, i. 157.

[4] The following were the sums paid to the account of secret service during these years:—October 25, 1758–9, £67,487; 1759–60, £66,520; 1760–1, £66,883; 1761–2, £95,407; 1762–3, £71,973; 1763–4, £68,611. N.B. Lord Bute was First Lord of the Treasury, May 1762–April 1763. *Commons Journals*, xxxii. 555 sqq.; and see the accounts, *Grenville Papers*, iii. 144, where the difference appears to be still greater. During the first three years of the new reign, moreover, the Irish Civil List was increased by £17,000 a year, £1000 being given to Viri, the Sardinian minister, for his services in the Peace negotiations. Walpole, *George III*, i. 268 and cf. i. 168 sqq. and also above, vol. ii. p. 51.

[5] *Hist. of the late Minority*, 67.

of which Bute's Chancellor of the Exchequer provided for supply, instead of being offered publicly, was distributed privately amongst the principal supporters of the government at a premium of 10 or 11 per cent., an alarming instance of the most dangerous form of public corruption and dishonesty, which cost the national treasury £385,000[1].

Such being the situation of affairs, few political parties have had greater cause or justification for organising a general attack upon the ministers, which would probably, taking into account Lord Bute's extreme unpopularity, misgovernment and incapacity, have been successful and have destroyed not only the minister but also the mistaken system of administration, which the King was attempting to force upon the nation.

The Duke of Newcastle was agitated and exasperated by the recent acts of violence and proscription and by the gradual abandonment of himself by his former followers. He fell ill, and on recovering showed a keen anxiety, being now entirely alienated from the Court, to immediately organise reprisals and commence an active opposition. He gave, moreover, some encouragement to Wilkes, who had now begun to publish his series of *North Britons*[2].

Lord Hardwicke, on the contrary, while sympathising deeply with the Duke and expressing the greatest indignation at the acts of violence committed, desired to continue in that course of conduct which he had from the beginning marked out for himself; advised the postponement of all hostile action against the government on the ground of the absence of any prospect of support in Parliament, and considered that the wisest policy was still to await further developements. He urged the Duke not to give way to complaints but to show a bold front to the enemy, whose misdeeds would turn at last upon themselves. Superficial honours added little to the enjoyment of life, and the truest and surest ground of happiness was to despise them.

His desire for peace and retirement, possibly owing in part to advancing years and to the beginning of insidious disease, but chiefly to the conviction that his work was finished, was very strong at this time. He wished to spend the few years that remained to him of life in the undisturbed tranquillity of his family circle.

[1] Below, p. 456; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1305 sqq.; May's *Const. Hist.* (1871) i. 382; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, quoting the *North Briton*, 93 sqq.

[2] N. 261, f. 206.

"I expect in a few days to have my house full of my children," he writes to the Duke of Newcastle on September 21, 1762, "from which I promise myself a great deal of pleasure. They are all now resorting to the old nest except the *ambassador extraordinary*[1].... It would be unreasonable in me to flatter myself with the hopes of many more of these opportunities[2]." "Happier in his children," the Duke of Newcastle wrote, "no man ever was than yourself. Quid voveas majus[3]?"

The advice offered by him to the Duke was not, however, entirely influenced by personal inclinations. It was his sincere conviction that an attitude of waiting and inactivity was for the present the best for the Duke and for the country, and this opinion was now shared by the Duke of Newcastle's chief friends, including the Duke of Cumberland[4]. Lord Kinnoull repeated Lord Hardwicke's counsels, almost in the same words, reminding him of his advice to "pursue" a plan of real retirement, since opposition would lead him "into a scene of endless disquiet and vexation, which, from the sensibility and goodness of your heart, you would feel more than any other man[5]." The Duke of Devonshire wrote in the same strain. "I fear there is nothing to be done. I look upon Mr Pitt as gone....The Marquis [of Rockingham] agreed with me that we had much better lie by for the present; otherwise we should only show our weakness and expose ourselves[6]."

These counsels of prudence and inaction, however, could not be acceptable to the Duke of Newcastle. He was far from acquiescing in the notion of complete retirement or, according to his own phrase, of being "treated as an old piece of household stuff[7]." Moreover, Lord Hardwicke seems to have been generally spared in the abuse poured by Lord Bute's pamphleteers upon the Whig Lords, and the proscriptions and severities exercised by the government were aimed almost exclusively at the Duke's friends and dependents, while those of Lord Hardwicke, in spite of Fox's remonstrances, had been intentionally passed over. "My Lord, in what way," wrote Fox to Bute, on March 11, 1763, "is Lord Hardwicke and his family to be considered? Are the sons to wait, with £20,000 a year from the King, for an opportunity to

[1] Sir Joseph Yorke, who was nominated as such to the abortive Congress of Augsburg.

[2] N. 257, f. 318.

[3] N. 254, f. 407.

[4] *Rockingham Mem.* i. 154.

[5] Below, p. 449.

[6] Below, pp. 432 sqq.; N. 260, f. 287; *Rockingham Mem.* i. 153.

[7] p. 420.

oppose his measures, and not taking the most trifling steps in support of them, nay saying, as they do publicly, that their Father's friendship with the Duke of Newcastle is sacred and that they shall abide by it? I would bring them to explanation by removing at least Sir Joseph Yorke from his embassy, and his younger brother from the Board of Trade, where you want a vacancy[1]." Lord Bute, however, rejected these importunities, hoping to gain Lord Hardwicke's support, or at least to avoid his open hostility, and all Lord Hardwicke's sons and followers retained their offices[2], the project especially of dismissing Sir Joseph Yorke being personally repudiated by the Favourite[3].

These distinctions not unnaturally inflamed still further the Duke of Newcastle's jealousy and vexation, and increased his desire to deal a blow at the administration. At length, in March 1763, another attempt was made at uniting the Whig forces. Lord Temple announced that he had at last brought Pitt and the Whig Lords together, and spoke of Pitt's regard for the Attorney-General[4]. On March 8 a great dinner took place at the Duke of Devonshire's, at which Lords Hardwicke, Rockingham, Temple, the Dukes of Devonshire and Newcastle and Pitt were all present, and this was followed by several others attended by the most influential persons in both Houses[5].

Lord Hardwicke, however, still maintained his attitude of neutrality, and kept an entirely free hand in Parliament. On March 7, 1763, he supported the government on "parliamentary principles," and "the experience of an old parliamentary man," in resisting the demand for the production of the war accounts[6]. On the other hand, he made a strong attack upon, and voted against, the Cider Bill.

This was an ill-considered measure, bringing in only £75,000 a year and imposing a special burden upon the farmers and landowners of the cider counties. The tax was also extremely unpopular, as extending the system of excise already placed on beer, and which from the first, chiefly on account of the

[1] pp. 451, 453; *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 192.

[2] p. 454; H. 4, f. 336; N. 261, ff. 171–192, 194, 203.

[3] p. 392; H. 4, f. 241; N. 254, f. 287; H. 73, f. 273; N. 258, f. 14; *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 64.

[4] p. 456.

[5] p. 455; N. 263, ff. 151, 188; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 91; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 219.

[6] p. 455; Walpole, *George III*, i. 196.

domiciliary visits permitted to the government officials, had been regarded as an infringement of popular liberties. Its introduction at this moment showed a surprising want of prudence and political tact in the minister. It had, however, been proposed because Sir Francis Dashwood, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, it was said, was unable to add up more than three rows of figures, "could not be made to understand a tax on linen, which was first intended, sufficiently to explain it to the House, and it had to be laid aside in consequence[1]." In the Commons it was attacked vehemently by Pitt, who declared that an Englishman's house would no longer be his castle[2].

Lord Hardwicke spoke in the Lords on the second reading, on March 28, "appearing" in the debate, wrote the Duke of Newcastle, "with his usual superiority[3]." He began by complaining of the disagreeable option offered to the Lords, of rejecting the only extraordinary supply of the year or of swallowing the bill whole, and of the little time allowed them for the consideration of the measure, the objections to which were numberless and impossible for him to go through. He must therefore confine his attention to the two great lines of the bill. In the first place, the bill was bad, as extending the excise to improper objects. Every former excise had been levied on some definite trade, and persons engaging in such trade voluntarily subjected themselves to the law. Cider making, on the contrary, was an ordinary occupation of a farmer, in certain counties, and an excise should not extend to every subject who may happen to do a particular act in the course of his family affairs. In the second place, it was an additional tax laid only on the cider counties. The fruit from which cider was made was the great produce of the farms, which raised their value, and in consideration of which they paid higher rents as well as the land-tax. It was hard that the country gentlemen, who had borne the burden and heat of the day cheerfully and supported the war, should be thus rewarded by an additional land-tax. It might be said—so is the malt-tax. He admitted it, but that was an additional tax common to the whole kingdom, while this was a third land-tax imposed only on certain counties. He advised the government to lay aside the bill and send up another. If the want of

[1] Lord Shelburne, *Life*, i. 186, a statement corroborated by Bute to Charles Yorke, see below, p. 387.

[2] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1307.

[3] N. 264, f. 17.

time should be pleaded, he would reply that such an objection was unparliamentary and had been declared so by a standing order of the House, that of May 5, 1668, No. 24, which he would now read. The House should continue to sit till Whitsuntide if necessary, and such a prolongation of the session would entail little inconvenience[1].

This was the last occasion on which Lord Hardwicke is recorded as having spoken in the House of Lords, of which he had been the most conspicuous figure and the leader for nearly 30 years; and it is worthy of note that his latest words there were uttered in protest—one made indeed on other occasions, and often heard since—against the hurried transaction of business sent up from the Commons without due time for deliberation and for necessary amendment, and that his last recorded vote was given against a money-bill, a right of the Lords which had been rarely exercised, but which had never become obsolete. In spite, however, of the opposition which the bill encountered, it was carried in both Houses by large majorities.

Meanwhile, notwithstanding the completeness of these triumphs in the administration and in Parliament, Lord Bute had for some time been sensible that his authority was slipping from him, and that his position was every day becoming more precarious. He began to find that "his greatest struggle would be with the people[2]." The increasing hostility in the nation, in spite of the King's support and the subservience of Parliament, threatened to become an insurmountable obstacle to his retention of the sole power. At a meeting in August of the Surrey gentlemen at Guildford, the company had unanimously refused to drink his health, an unprecedented reflection upon the First Minister of the Crown[3]. On the occasion of the annual banquet at the Guildhall, on November 9, a violent assault was made upon his coach during its passage thither. "He was insulted," wrote Lord Hardwicke to his son; "much hissed and dirt thrown at his chariot, in which Sir Francis Dashwood was with him[4]." His reception was scarcely better within the Hall, where, ignored and treated with studied coldness, he sat abandoned and dejected in a corner[5]. He was again dangerously assaulted, while on his way to Parliament, on

[1] Lord H.'s notes printed in *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1311; according to Walpole, *George III*, i. 199, "he was answered well and with severity by Lord Marchmont."

[2] *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 77.

[3] Below, p. 407.

[4] H. 4, f. 304.

[5] Below, p. 432.

November 25, at the opening of the new session[1]; and the King himself, on going to the House of Lords, was received in "sullen silence[2]."

Riots took place in the cider counties, and the city of London, in spite of Lord Bute's private attempts to prevent it[3], together with many other corporations and counties, petitioned against the tax. He made great efforts to obtain addresses from the country in favour of the Peace. Threats and bribes were lavishly and recklessly employed, but by no means with universal success[4], and the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke, as Chancellor and Steward respectively of the University of Cambridge, took the strong step, a few weeks later, of flatly refusing to convey the address of congratulation of that body to the King[5]. In the same way, Pitt declined to have anything to do with the address from Bath, and resigned his seat for the borough. The revolt of the Whig forces on the occasion of the Cider Bill and the opposition dinners, alarmed the minister[6]. Overtures made in various quarters for support, even to Lord Waldegrave, were repulsed[7]. Lord Bute had exhausted his resources in endeavouring to obtain the good opinion of the public, and the tide of hostility was rising higher and higher. He was frightened at the constant attacks made upon him in the Press, and especially in the *North Briton*. He was isolated and neglected in the Cabinet of his own making[8]. "It is already obvious," writes Walpole on February 28, "that Lord Bute's levée is not the present path to fortune[9]." He was threatened with the loss of the King's confidence, who declared him "deficient in political firmness[10]." His nerves began to give way and his physical powers were weakened by ill-health[11]. "If I had but £50 per annum," he writes, in February, "I would retire on bread and water, and think it

[1] *Grenville Papers*, i. 452; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 127; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 194 *n.*; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 160.

[2] H. 52, f. 31.

[3] Below, p. 456; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 107 sqq.

[4] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1274; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 89; according to Almon's *Anecdotes of Chatham*, i. 463, bribes were distributed to the lords-lieutenant and corporations to procure them.

[5] Walpole, *George III*, i. 222.

[6] N. 264, f. 15; below, p. 456; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1275.

[7] Walpole's *George III*, i. 197.

[8] Below, pp. 406, 419.

[9] *Letters*, v. 290.

[10] Sir G. Rose, *Diaries*, ii. 192; below, pp. 457–8, 493.

[11] Below, p. 493.

luxury compared with what I suffer[1]. "I am afraid," he declared, "not only of falling myself, but of involving my Royal Master in my ruin—It is time for me to retire[2]."

On April 8, 1763, Lord Bute therefore announced his resignation, having accomplished the two great objects for which he had taken office, the Peace and the destruction of the Whig party. As "minister behind the curtain," he retained for some time, in spite of his assertions to the contrary, his influence over the King and the course of affairs, and hoped, when the storm had passed away, to return to office. Meanwhile, after settling the new ministry and distributing enormous sums of money to his relations and supporters[3], he retired to Harrogate. The following is his own account of the reasons which induced his resignation.

Conversation with Lord Bute from the Attorney-General, April 9, 1763[4].

Lord Bute sent for me on Thursday. Happening to be out of town, a second message was sent to desire to see me this morning at 9 o'clock.

He told me that he wished to have informed me of his resolution the day before he carried it into execution, from the respect due to my rank (as he was pleased to express it) in the King's service and in the House of Commons; that for a long time his health, nerves, etc: had been much impaired, which made it impossible for him to go on; that his ambition had been to support the King's affairs after the Duke of Newcastle quitted; that he should have been blamed if he had then retired; but when the peace was made it had been always in his view, as the King knew, from whom he had no secrets; that he should leave the King's affairs in much abler hands than his own, Lord Halifax, Lord Egremont, Mr Grenville, whom he had known from 12 years of age, a very worthy and able man, and whose turn lay towards the revenue and to that public economy which was so much wanted; that he hoped when he (Lord Bute) was out of the way, the King's servants, who were most able to assist, would find their difficulties removed and do their best.

[1] *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Earl of Lonsdale, 132.

[2] Adolphus, *Hist. of George III*, i. 117; cf. Dutens, *Mém. d'un Voyageur*, ii. 254.

[3] Below, pp. 457 sqq.; Walpole's *George III*, i. 210; *Letters*, v. 304; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 130, 132; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 220.

[4] N. 263, f. 92; rough draft H. 80, f. 60.

He then stopped and seemed to expect an answer. I said, as to what related to his Lordship, he was the best judge of his own situation and the state of persons and things. As to the King, I thought it my duty to say my humble opinion, that his Majesty's affairs required all the strength which union at home could give in the beginnings of this peace, for the system of foreign affairs, for the improvement of the revenue and public estate, and for the due government of the colonies, which now formed so vast an empire in America. Therefore I doubted much how the conduct of the H[ouse] of C[ommons] could be put on so narrow a plan; that tho' I had a respect for Mr Grenville, to whom I had been long known, yet experience had shown it would not do, and that his situation was now much altered since the last year. Besides the former prejudices of many, the Duke of Newcastle's friends were more than ever alienated from him, because they thought him the instrument of what happened the last year; that all which had passed since had produced a general soreness amongst the Whigs, which would show itself more and more every day. With the Tories Mr Grenville had his weight; Mr Fox's friends would not incline cordially to him, and I added to all this that his giving up the lead last year to Mr Fox was a step impossible to be recovered by him; that, in short, nothing essential could be done, without opening and widening the bottom of the King's administration[1].

He gave no answer to particulars; agreed that the King's affairs required strength etc: and then took notice of what I had dropt of *a narrow plan* etc: etc: as proceeding from a suspicion that he would play the minister behind the curtain. He assured me that he would not; no ministers could go on in that manner; that he had accepted a responsible office so early because he did not think the other situation consistent with the service of the Crown, and that when he parted with the responsibility, he would retire absolutely and part from the whole; that he knew his own situation, what with national prejudices, what with personal prejudices and particularly the term *Favourite* (which had been worked up in so many shapes), some of those who were most fit to serve the King would not have him; that there had been too many changes; they had gone too far already; that all this had drawn a great deal of unpopularity on a very amiable Prince of which he must not be the instrument; this he owed to the King from duty and affection[2].

I said that the King certainly deserved all those returns; his way of thinking was just and honourable; that when he told me

[1] Cf. the Duke of Bedford's advice to Lord Bute:—"For God's sake persuade His Majesty to widen the bottom of administration, and if he has a mind to keep those out of his cabinet, who have behaved to him with the least respect, let the Dukes of Newcastle, Devonshire, Grafton, Earl Hardwicke, etc. be called again into His Majesty's service." *Bedford Corr.* iii. 228.

[2] Cf. *Grenville Papers*, i. 484–5, and *Bedford Corr.* iii. 223.

he would not act behind the curtain, I must believe it; but it would be suspected, as things stood, unless the bottom was widened, which the King's service demanded for the reasons he had agreed.

He then repeated that he would retire absolutely; that he was sensible at the same time that abuse and clamour would not cease, and to other reproaches it would be added that he was retiring from a storm, and durst not stand it.

I answered that I had no pretensions from the honour of acquaintance or confidence to tell him my opinion; but I must say that he had done wisely; and if he had staid, he would have been more attacked than ever Sir R. Walpole was from all parts of England about a general excise; and that I thought the worst consequence of what had happened in the affair of the Cider Bill was the tendency of it to damn all excises, and thereby obstruct the improvement of the revenue.

This he admitted, and said that he had thought little of taxes; his object was the Peace.

I happened to say that, being engaged in the hurry of my own business at the Bar, I had heard nothing of the Cider Bill till it was more than half gone thro' in the House of Commons.

He answered that the truth was, tho' it did not much become a First Lord of the Treasury to say it, he knew very little of the alterations made in it. The linen tax, etc: had been thought of; but his friend, Sir Francis [Dashwood] (a very good man), found difficulties in stating it, as the subject was complicated and mixed with our treaties with Russia. The cider was then thought of upon a principle of equality. Originally, the tax was laid on the first buyer, afterwards amended in the House of Commons to a tax upon the maker, and then Glover[1] began the attack. Under these circumstances he thought it hard to be obliged to defend it in the House of Lords, having had so little hand in it; he was very sorry for it; it was unlucky, and would draw unpopularity upon the King.

After this a considerable pause ensued on which, not finding Lord Bute disposed to be more explicit, I rose to take leave as being troublesome to him on [a] day when he usually went to Kew for the air. I thanked him for this personal mark of attention to me, and desired leave to ask whether he had any particular commands for me, either as a private man or as one, who had just ceased (with the King's leave) to be a public man.

He said, not as a public man. He saw great difficulties, and thought I saw them too. He did not know what were the connections of great persons in this country at present. (I understood him to mean how far your Grace etc: were engaged with Lord

[1] Richard Glover. See note, vol. ii. p. 252; he opposed the subsidy for Portugal and appears to have supported George Grenville's faction.

T[emple] and Mr P[itt]. But I did not take up the expression to construe it nor give it any answer whatsoever.)...

During the whole conversation he said nothing of your Grace, the D[uke] of D[evonshire], M[arquis] of R[ockingham], Lord T[emple], Lord Hardwicke or Mr Pitt.

In the course of our talk I asked concerning Mr Fox. He said that Fox had stipulated to go into the House of Lords at the end of the session, and reminded Lord Bute of it a month ago. He added that many of his friends did not like F[ox]; he was not happy in the opinion of mankind, loved asking for little offices, but [Lord Bute] avoided saying one word by way of complaint of him.

The Duke of Bedford's and the Attorney-General's wise counsels were not followed. The King was still determined to exclude the Whigs, or as Lord Bute wrote, "never, upon any account, to suffer those ministers of the late reign, who have attempted to fetter and enslave him, ever to come into his service while he lives to hold the sceptre[1]." George Grenville was made by Bute First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer on the condition of engaging to support the same policy[2]; and a cabinet was formed of the same complexion as the last, with Lords Egremont and Halifax as Secretaries of State. Sir Francis Dashwood, Bute's celebrated Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose tenure of office had made him a laughing-stock[3], became Lord Le Despencer, and withdrew to the Great Wardrobe. Lord Sandwich became First Lord of the Admiralty, and Fox obtained his coveted peerage as Lord Holland. He also succeeded in retaining his lucrative pay-mastership after some vulgar and ignominious altercations; but further concessions, which he asked for, were refused. His demand for the title of Viscount in order "that his family should stand before Pitt's in the list of Peers," was rejected[4]. "Mr Fox," writes Birch to Lord Royston, "demands the title of an Earl upon pretence of a promise from Lord Bute for which he cites Lord Shelburne as a witness, who denies his knowledge of any such promise, upon which Mr Fox expresses great surprise to find so much falsehood in so young a man." Fox and Calcraft, who had hitherto been his faithful adherent, but who now suddenly deserted

[1] *Bedford Corr.* iii. 224.

[2] *Ib.*; Stanhope, v. 39 *n.*; *Lord Shelburne's Life*, i. 186 sqq.; *Grenville Papers*, i. 452; ii. 32, 86.

[3] *Bedford Corr.* iii. 222.

[4] Fox to Bute, March 31, April 12, 1763, in *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 223–4.

him and attached himself to Pitt, gave each other "mutual discharges[1]." Retailing, writes Walpole, his pretended grievances to Richard Rigby[2], formerly, while Fox possessed place and power, his close friend and supporter, and leaning on Rigby's coachdoor, the latter replied, "*You* tell your story of Shelburne; *he* has a damned one to tell of you. I do not trouble myself which is the truth," and pushing him aside ordered his coachman to drive away[3]. Thus Fox quitted the public scene, with a character lowered and completely blasted, or to use Lord Bute's phrase, "not happy in the opinion of mankind," but with all the prizes for which he had struggled and which alone he valued.

CORRESPONDENCE

Rev. Thos. Birch to Lord Royston

[H. 51, f. 282.] LONDON, *May* 26, 1762.

...From the King's levée I went to the House of Lords, where the Lord Chief Baron [Parker] and Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas [Pratt] had given their opinion against an infant's being barred by the Statute of 27 Henry VIII of dower if she has jointure. Five judges had delivered their opinions on the question yesterday, four of whom, Wilmot, Bathurst, Smythe and Adams, were on [of] the opposite opinion...there were only three of the five of the Lord Chancellor's decree and four against it. After the Judges had done, Lord Ravensworth laboured to put off the determination of the cause which Lord Hardwicke opposed: and the House being determined to finish it today, Lord Hardwicke spoke an hour at least against the decree, and the impossibility of remedying by any Act of Parliament, the inconveniences of it, if it should be confirmed[4]. His Lordship did not spare the Lord Chief Justice

[1] H. 52, ff. 44, 50; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 245.

[2] Richard Rigby (1722–1788), one of the most corrupt and unscrupulous politicians of the time. According to Lord Charlemont, "the profligacy of his principles would have scandalized the Court of Tiberius" (*Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Earl of Charlemont, 10), now Master of the Rolls in Ireland, later Vice-treasurer of Ireland, and Paymaster of the Forces where he enriched himself with half a million; objected to Chatham's public funeral.

[3] *George III*, i. 203, 207 sqq.; *Life of Lady Sarah Lennox*, i. 72, 78; *Life of Lord Shelburne*, i. 185, 199 sqq.; J. H. Jesse, *George Selwyn*, i. 267.

[4] *Drury* v. *Drury*, brought on appeal from Lord Chancellor Henley's decree who had ventured to reject an *obiter dictum* of Lord Hardwicke, to the House of Lords and reversed. *Reports of Cases in Chancery* arranged by R. Henley Eden (1818), ii. 59 sqq., where Lord H.'s speech is given.

Pratt for bad law and groundless assertions, delivered with great confidence....

[The Lord Chancellor had also unwisely spoken with contempt of the conveyancers as of persons whose time was "more dedicated to perusal than thought," to which Lord Hardwicke replied, "The opinion of conveyancers in all times, and their constant...course is of great weight....The ablest men in the profession have been conveyancers."]

[H. 51, f. 286.] *June 1st*, 1762.

...Lord Chief Justice Pratt has lowered his character extremely by his speech last Wednesday in the House of Lords, scarce decent in an advocate, but highly unfit for a Judge. His own view seemed to be to abuse his brother Judges who were of an opposite opinion to his, and particularly Sir John Eardley Wilmot, who had most distinguished himself on that side. Your Lordship may judge of the delicacy of his raillery by this specimen, that in introducing his answers to Mr Justice Wilmot's arguments, he usually began thus, "We are told *forsooth* etc.," which last word was repeated in that manner at least twenty times[1]....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[H. 73, f. 272.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *May* 28, 1762.

[Congratulates the Duke on the Duke of Cumberland's approbation of his action and manner of resigning and continues] I heartily wish that the conduct in that quarter had been always uniformly agreeable to that sense, which is now so handsomely professed, *of your long, expensive, unwearied, and most useful services*....I cannot restrain myself from suggesting one word upon...the very gracious invitation to the Lodge. Your Grace has not been used to go there, nor do I recollect that you were ever asked. I will not enter into the reasons how that has happened, but if you should now begin that resort, it will, I fear, give a handle to suspicions, insinuations and malicious reports of caballing and concert in order to opposition, and what will be traduced under the name of faction, however unjustly. I think the appearance of this would do no good to H.R.H. and great prejudice to your Grace. I submit this to your consideration and beg that you will have the goodness to burn this letter[2]....

[1] Pratt had only just (in December 1761) been raised to the Bench. Sir John Eardley Wilmot was one of the most learned and experienced judges of the day.

[2] See pp. 433–4.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 254, f. 383.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June* 17, 1762.

[He reflects upon the recent attempts of Lord Sandwich to renew his connection with the Duke.] I fear he has spent the little stock of credit which he had. His falling upon his old friend, the Duke of Bedford, does not at all add to my opinion of him, tho' perhaps it may be an indication that that noble duke is not at present quite so well with a *certain greater duke* [of Cumberland], as he once was. Your Grace concludes very truly that these things only serve for amusement. For my own part, I lay no weight upon them and never shall. It is a maxim with me, *non haec in foedera.* Perhaps your Grace will say, as you once did on a former occasion[1]—that this is going too far; that it proceeds from revenge or resentment, and you disclaim that. If I know my own heart, I am not vindictive, nor am I apt to retain resentments. Nor do I look upon this rule of conduct as proceeding from any such motive. It is only common discretion and the precaution, which prudence dictates, to form a judgment of men by their past conduct, and not to trust those again who have once deceived one or used one ill without a cause. I know that great statesmen, or those who mean either to maintain themselves in power, or to labour up the hill of an opposition, often find it for their purpose to make use of such persons, as far as they will go, and think they know the mark how far they may trust them. But as I am not in the first case, nor do intend to put myself into the latter, I shall not, at my time of life, take to those arts.

I said the time may come [*i.e.* for opposing the administration] but was not then come, and I think so still. I think your Grace and your friends have nothing to do at present but lie by. This new ministry has enough upon their hands, and if they can't make their peace, will soon find themselves in the greatest difficulties. The unpopularity is rising fast enough. But I should not wish to do anything at present to give them a pretence to allege (as Queen Anne's Tory ministry did, and as my Lord Bolingbroke has printed over and over), that the opposition they met with forced them to accept a worse peace than otherwise they should have been able to make. Towards the approach of the next session things will open....

[1] Probably on the subject of Fox.

I have seen nobody but my own family since I came to town, nor has any one letter been circulated to me since your resignation. I count it an honour to *me* that they thus join us together. And indeed, I am very glad that they send me none of their letters, for it would only lay me under difficulties; give a pretence now and then to ask an opinion or to summon one to councils; whereas I have examined my porter and find that from the same period I have had no summons to any meeting, except to the Cabinet for the King's Speech, the morning of the prorogation in his Majesty's presence; and, which is more remarkable, I had not the honour of one invitation to dinner on his Majesty's Birthday....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 254, f. 417.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June* 19, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

I had my conference with the great man this morning, and make it my first business to give your Grace an account of it. After the first compliments were over, he began by saying that he wanted to have an opportunity of seeing me, in order to say something upon certain events which had happened of late; that from the time the Duke of Newcastle had taken the resolution to quit his employment (which he was very sorry for) the King had cast his eyes upon him (Lord B[ute]); that he saw the difficulty and danger of it, but his duty, obligations and devotion to the King were such that he could not decline anything which his Majesty inclined to; that therefore he had submitted, but he vowed to God he had taken this envied station without any *hostile intentions* against any set of men or any person whatsoever, but that one of the first things he had been surprised with was a report that Sir Joseph Yorke was to be recalled from the Hague.—He protested that it had never entered into his thoughts and, he was convinced, never into the King's[1]; and that Sir Joseph's behaviour had been such as had deserved and met with the highest approbation. I would have cut this short,

[1] Cf. N. 257, f. 431. D. of N. to H., September 30, 1762, "The King told the Duke of Bedford that he intended to recall Sir Joseph Yorke from the Hague, for he was a friend of the Duke of Newcastle's and informed him of everything," but "when my Lord Bute was spoke to about it," he had replied "No,...I won't begin with him. If the D. of N. begins, he must take the consequences, or to that effect."

and interposing said that I had this as news from London and had seen the paragraphs in the papers, but that I had never believed one word of it; for, as I was persuaded he had not done anything to deserve displeasure, I relied on the King's justice and goodness, and had too good an opinion of his Lordship's equity, to credit such a rumour, and therefore had never given myself the trouble to inquire about it. I threw this in at first to avoid any colour of a request or intercession. His Lordship proceeded, that he owed this to his good friends, the Prussian ministers, from whom he could trace it here, and he knew they had writ it into Holland. But how absurd was it, in case he had meant removals, to begin with a foreign minister, especially such a one? It was not natural. He said Mr Jenkinson[1] had showed him a letter from Joe whereby he found it had reached him; and as it might give him some uneasiness, he had last night writ him a letter with his own hand, of which he produced a copy and desired that I would read it. It was plainly writ to be shown, very strong and very handsome, absolutely denying the story, full of acknowledgments of Joe's good behaviour and of the King's and his own entire satisfaction with him, and full of compliments to me and my family, from which he took occasion to aggravate the absurdity of the story. In short, the letter was in his best manner which your Grace knows.

This being over, he proceeded to more general talk; but you will find it was all *so general* as to lay me under no difficulty.—He already saw too much of the weight and difficulty of his new office; that he had heard your Grace complain of it, but he saw more of it since he came into it; that it would require the assistance of all honest men to support the King's affairs and the necessary service of the nation.—This was the only hint I had *as to personal conduct*, which you see was hardly sufficient to require an answer. However, I was resolved not to let it drop but took that occasion to say—That nobody could possibly have more duty and zeal for the King than I had, nor would go further to support what I was convinced was for His Majesty's service and the interest of the nation, which must be the same; that I had begun this conduct in conjunction with my friends in the time of His Majesty's great-grandfather, had carried it on thro' all the reign of his grandfather,

[1] Charles Jenkinson (1727–1808), Bute's private secretary and Under-Secretary of State; M.P. for Cockermouth; in 1763 joint Secretary to the Treasury and leader of the King's party after Bute's retirement; later filled various offices and was created Earl of Liverpool.

both in place and out of place, and that I should continue the like conduct, according to the conviction of my conscience, under the grandson; that as to persons, he knew the connexion and friendship I had with the Duke of Newcastle, that he had himself seen instances of it, and in all the intercourse I had had with his Lordship, had proceeded upon that *as a principle*, but I was not sure whether he knew the date of it; it was of no less than four and forty years standing, and that I was persuaded his Lordship would have a worse opinion of me than I wished he should have, if I was capable of doing anything to weaken or depart from that attachment; that upon this foot, in conjunction with your Grace, he would always find me. To this he replied handsomely enough—that he neither expected nor desired any other answer from me; that he knew me too well; that he only wished and desired that *after the Duke of Newcastle*, I would entertain some share of regard and friendship for him. To this I only answered by a proper general compliment.

Lord Bute then declared how much he wished for peace; that I had been a witness to his disposition in our late meetings; that conquest and acquisition were not his view further than they were necessary to security. This gave me a natural occasion to say that I hoped their secret negotiation was in a hopeful state and likely to succeed. To this his Lordship made no direct answer, but said the Court of France was like other Courts, and when they saw the libels published here and were told that divisions were rising in England, might be willing to see if they could make advantages of it. This makes me believe that there is some hitch in the progress; for he did not mention any one fact nor enter into any explanation....

This was the substance of the whole; and I have made good my word that it could lay me under no difficulty; for you see I myself voluntarily brought on the only material point, and I chose to do it in order to have no ambiguity. His Lordship's behaviour was very civil, decent and calm, without any *aigreur* at all, but I thought I could discern under it some apprehensiveness. He said not one word about my being summoned to meetings or not, nor about the discontinuing of the circulation of letters to me, and your Grace may be sure I did not give the least hint tending to it....

Whilst I am writing, I receive some very fine cherries and strawberries from your Grace, for which I return a thousand

thanks....If Lord Royston has the pleasure to be with your Grace, this letter will serve also for his information. I am most unalterably, my dearest Lord, ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 285; N. 254, f. 421.] CLAREMONT, *June* 19, 1762.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I cannot delay one moment returning your Lordship my sincerest thanks...for the very very firm and becoming manner in which your part of the conversation passed. I want words to express my gratitude for the honourable and affectionate testimony you gave of our long, very long and uninterrupted friendship, which has been the glory and comfort of my life. I cannot say anything in commendation of the other party—great civility but neither confidence, communication nor any real mark of respect; that was omitted from his Lordship's knowledge of your goodness to me, confirmed so very kindly to him now by yourself.

I think upon the whole his Lordship sees the difficulties he is engaged in, which will increase upon him; and he is too proud either to own it or ask any assistance upon it. But if what I hear is true, he must soon be obliged to do both; for I am told the run is greater than ever, and that it is the general opinion that it is impossible for him to hold it....They are *nibbling* already at borrowing money in the city, and give out that they shall want but six millions next year. Poor silly men. They don't know what they want; nor if they did, how to procure it. The only persons they have in the city are Mr Glover[1], Mr Salvadore[2] and Mr Fox's particular friends, proper persons to procure *money loans* for the public. I think it is plain that the Peace meets with some obstruction. My Lord Bute has now found out that the divisions here affect it, and if his want of credit at home should be known and believed abroad, that will affect it more....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 255, f. 44.] *June* 23, 1762.

...How could my Lord Bute imagine that such a conversation could serve him with a man of my Lord Hardwicke's capacity and experience? No satisfaction upon any one point, except that ridiculous report about Sir Joseph Yorke's recall....

[1] See above, p. 387 *n.*

[2] Probably Joseph Salvadore, the Jewish financier.

Duke of Newcastle to Hugh Valence Jones[1]

[N. 255, f. 60.] CLAREMONT, *June* 24, 1762.

DEAR JONES,

I cannot sufficiently thank you for the continuance of your affection and attention to me; tho' I receive daily many marks of the goodness of my friends, none equal those which I have daily from you....Your letter with an account of the meeting, and one I had at the same time with the same account from my Lord Hardwicke, astonished me. Such presumption, I had almost said impudence, in a minister, I never heard of before. To be desiring a conference with a man of my Lord Hardwicke's weight and dignity and to be pretending to make professions of regard to his Lordship, etc., at the same time that he had then actually summoned a meeting upon the affair of the Peace, and had not only left my Lord Hardwicke out of that meeting but had not vouchsafed to say one word to him of the object of it;...this treatment my Lord Hardwicke may forget, but I shall ever remember it, and I ought to do so, as I know this great man has brought this usage upon himself by his unalterable friendship and goodness to me. They know he is, and ever was, my sheet-anchor, and they treat him accordingly.

I am in hopes of having the pleasure of my Lord Hardwicke's company here [at Claremont] in a few days. I wish you would contrive it so as to come with him; it would make us all extremely happy....

Dear Jones, most gratefully yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. Everybody in this house loves you.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 255, f. 80.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June* 25, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am extremely obliged to your Grace for the honour of your letter of yesterday[2], and for the very kind and friendly manner in which you consider what you look upon as a neglect of me. I have so much sang-froid as not to look upon it in quite so strong a light as your goodness for me makes you do. I have reason to believe they talk it to others as if they avoided asking me any questions, or entering into any explanations about it, out of delicacy, in order not to lay me under any difficulties. Your

[1] Lord Hardwicke's nephew, formerly secretary to the Duke of Newcastle; see the D. of N. to Lord H. on the same topic, f. 57.

[2] H. 73, f. 293, in which the Duke expresses his indignation on the same subject.

Grace will easily guess the weight I lay upon such language; and I have my feelings (to borrow my Lord Ravensworth's phrase) as well as others; but I will never talk of this affair in such a style as to bring explanations upon myself, which might lay me under greater difficulties. In truth, I am heartily glad they have taken this part; for I know how to spend my time much more to my own satisfaction than in long sittings in hot rooms, and possibly not without some altercation, or in reading over quires of paper in order to find ten lines that may be material. As to nothing being said of it in my last Saturday's conference, it is very possible that the noble Lord may say that the open and plain declaration, which I chose to make to him, prevented his entering into that matter. But here it rests, and shall rest for me; for I will do nothing to tempt an *éclaircissement*, and I hope my friends will not....

I am sincerely sorry for anything that may hinder the effectuating a reasonable peace....As to Mr Pitt, I have heard nothing of him....As I could not go to the Birthday, I went to the Levée, being the first after that solemnity and also the first after the King's recovery[1]. His Majesty was very civil as usual and condoled with me very properly on the loss of poor Lord Anson.... I please myself much with the thoughts of coming to Claremont.... But you have so much resort to you at present that I wish to avoid it, and therefore shall be much obliged to your Grace to let me know when you are most likely to be pretty free from that kind of interruption....I am unfeignedly, my dearest Lord,

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 255, f. 164.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June* 30, 1762.

...I had lately a long visit from the *new Secretary* [George Grenville]....You will easily believe me when I say it is impossible for me to relate the conversation, but when I have the honour to wait upon you I will endeavour to give you the best idea of it I can[2]....One thing he said observable, that it appeared by the last returns, signed by himself, that Prince Ferdinand had now an army

[1] From a severe attack of illness, supposed to be a precursor of the later attacks of insanity.

[2] Grenville's pedantic loquacity was proverbial.

of 100,000 men for the field. What madness to talk of dissolving such an army pending the war! But I thought it was said to lay it the harder upon His Highness, if he remained inactive and did nothing of *éclat*, for he added to that that the French army there was considerably weaker than it was the last year[1]....

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 248.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *July* 1, 1762.

DEAR ROYSTON,

I hasten to wish you joy of the great and glorious news[2]....I had a bulletin from Mr Secretary Grenville, and in the evening a very civil note from my Lord Bute, in his own hand, congratulating me upon the event, and adding a circumstance or two....You cannot imagine how comically *some people* look. What a mixture in their countenances! This German war may perhaps contribute more to their peace than any other part of the war. Such a victory happening so early in the campaign,...must have a great effect in France. M. de Choiseul must make peace for his own sake, for where will he find another General?

I went to Court today, to see faces. The Queen did not come to the Drawing-room, being so hot; but the King was there and very civil. He began with me upon the subject of this great news, which he said was unexpected. I laughed with his Majesty at the French calling it *a surprise*. A surprise by an army which had been marching three days directly towards them, and dislodging their advanced posts as they marched!...

The Duke of Newcastle is excessively happy on this occasion[3]. I am to go there on Monday, and return on Wednesday. On Friday or Saturday I propose to have the pleasure of finding you and Lady Grey, and the dear children in perfect health....

[1] But see the following letter in the MSS., N. 255, f. 176, where the Prince's army is given as 70 battalions and 60 squadrons against the French 100 battalions and 100 squadrons, and H. 10, f. 287, where Sir J. Y. states that the nominal amount of Prince F.'s forces never exceeded 94,000.

[2] Prince Ferdinand's victory over the French at Wilhelmsthal, June 24. N. 255, f. 128.

[3] He writes to Lord H., June 30, congratulating himself on having prevented the recall of the troops. N. 255, f. 160; H. 73, f. 299.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 255, f. 176.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *July* 1, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

I cannot delay one moment returning your Grace's obliging and joyful congratulations on this glorious victory obtained by Prince Ferdinand....I happened yesterday noon to go to take leave of Lord Grantham, and in turning out of Whitehall was stopt by a man who told me there was great news. I drove directly to the office and enquired for my old friend Weston, but *the Principal* for whom I did not enquire, came out to me....He told me Boyd said 200 officers were taken and that he himself had taken the parole of 140 of them. There was a great appearance of joy and gaiety, but I thought I could discern *something under that.* I said half joking, I suppose you will give us an extraordinary Gazette.... I am so much of your Grace's mind in the observations which you make upon this happy event that I wonder how these gentlemen can look people in the face....What will your friend the Duke of Bedford say to this? I suppose, *all for the worse.* It certainly makes it impossible to recall the troops till the campaign is over at least. Another breach of faith with his Grace! Adieu, till I have the honour and pleasure of seeing you....

Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke

[N. 255, f. 294.] CLAREMONT, *July* 9, 1762.

...I have had great pleasure this week, my Lord Hardwicke having passed a day or two here. I found him just what I wished him, in high health and spirits; the same able counsellor and the same cordial friend that I have known him to be now upwards of forty years, during which time, I think I may say, to the honour of us both, there has been the most uninterrupted and cordial friendship and agreement, both as to measures and men that ever was known between any two persons, especially in our high stations; and I have the comfort to see that out of employment it is the same, or if possible more increased than it was....

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 10, f. 282.] HAGUE, *July* 16, 1762.

...The late change in England has occasioned much speculation abroad, and I should tell an untruth if I pretended to say that it has raised our reputation or increased our credit. On the contrary those, who wished us well, thought our affairs in so promising a situation that, if we had continued in the same track, an honourable and advantageous peace would have been the consequence of this year's operations....[He proceeds to remark upon the bad and ungrateful treatment meted out to Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick by the new ministers.] The English who had spent the winter in England were kept back, the recruits of men, horses and artillery delayed and hardly an answer returned to the great number of letters wrote by our general, who attended, however, to the German part, and brought them into better order for the field than it has been, I am told, since the first campaign. During this period it transpired that Lord Bute accused the Princes of Brunswick of being his personal enemies, and particularly the reigning Duke and Prince Ferdinand, whom he accused of using him *cruelly*, as he termed it. When Lord Granby took his leave, he told him the same thing and in very high terms indeed, giving him leave to repeat them, tho' his Lordship softened them in his report like an honest man. [The marriage between Princess Augusta and the Hereditary Prince of Brunswick had been obstructed by various delays. No instructions for the coming campaign had been sent. Prince Ferdinand's conduct in these circumstances had been doubly meritorious.] Few generals would either have had the temper, resolution or ambition to have attempted what he has so nobly succeeded in....Everybody abroad is astonished at our quarrelling with the King of Prussia, when he had got the Czar and could be of use to us....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 73, f. 303; N. 255, f. 372.] CLAREMONT, *July* 16, 1762.

[Marsh, the Governor of the Bank of England, had threatened to resign, but the Duke would do all in his power to prevent this blow to the government.]

My Lord M[ansfield] talked slightingly rather [to West[1]] of my Lord Bute....He talked much about the *North Briton*; said my Lord Temple was the author and paid ten guineas for every paper which he did not write himself; that he had heard that Mr Pitt had wrote two of those papers, but that *that* paper signified nothing, if it was not supported[2]. He talked with great respect and regard for George Grenville....His Lordship (as represented) talked kindly

[1] James West (*c.* 1704–1772), bencher of the Middle Temple, F.R.S., M.P. for St Albans; Secretary to the Treasury, 1741–1762.

[2] But see below, p. 401.

of me; was glad to hear I was so well and so easy in my retirement, and hoped I should continue so; but did not, and would not, suppose that there could be a chance or possibility for me to come into business again. That, I think, his Lordship might as well have omitted; but he very unkindly made me, in some measure, the aggressor in this late affair....

The Princess Amelia was excessively agreeable and gracious[1]. Great part of our long conferences was upon *past times*. H. R. Highness spoke with the greatest kindness and respect of your Lordship. Her politics are extremely *judicious* and right. Her great rage is against Mr Fox who, she thinks, would have sold her brother to my Lord Bute, if he could. But this must be a great secret. Pitt is not in favour, but I think the lesser evil....I could wish to have a full conversation with you before you go to Wimpole....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 255, f. 379.] WREST, *July* 17, 1762, at night.

MY DEAR LORD,...

I am very glad that your visit to Tunbridge Wells succeeded so much to your satisfaction. I dare say the great Princess was, as she had reason, much flattered with it; as I am sure I am, and ought to be, by her condescension in taking notice of me. As to the *gentleman* whom she suspects of designs upon her brother, 'tis wonderful if she did not find out his principles and disposition before. It is pity also; for it might have saved some trouble and uneasiness formerly....

I never heard of a Governor of the Bank resigning, nor do I know enough of Mr Marsh to be able to judge what effect his resignation would be of. But your Grace is extremely in the right not to give countenance to anything that may tend to bring real distress upon Government (I don't say the administration) in point of money at such a juncture. Nor would it be of any use to the good cause to have an ill-intentioned Governor of the Bank elected.

No part of your Grace's letter surprises me so much as the account of Lord M[ansfield]'s conversation with Mr West. Surely it cannot be quite correct. I don't believe that my Lord Temple is author of the *North Briton*, nor that Mr Pitt wrote any of those papers. The professing to have very little communication with my Lord Bute, and seldom to see him, is agreeable to his way of

[1] The Duke had just returned from a visit to the Princess at Tunbridge Wells. He had previously visited the Duke of Cumberland at Windsor.

talking to me, but the preference given to George Grenville before his Lordship is quite new....I cannot persuade myself that Lord Mansfield talked such stuff....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 256, f. 82.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *July* 28, 1762, at night.

MY DEAR LORD,...

About ten o'clock I went to my appointment and was with Lord Bute some time. As soon as I returned home, and before I went to the King's levée, I scribbled down the inclosed memorandum of what passed....For my own part, I can see no probability of their agreeing as things now stand. No glimmerings of agreeing with Spain; nothing yet said of Portugal etc:; and to my apprehension it is the wildest of all imaginations to fancy that France will just now break with Spain, and throw away all the boasted advantages of the Bourbon alliance. Your Grace will also observe that the Duc de Choiseul keeps everything tending to that in dark hints, thrown out in private notes to Solar[1], and nothing of that kind is articulated in the despatches, as I found by Lord Bute.

...Charles dined with my Lord Chancellor on Monday with the rest of the principal counsel[2]....His Lordship (who was just then at six o'clock come from the first meeting)...whispered in his ear "that this country was in a melancholy situation."...But notwithstanding all this, and notwithstanding the formal introduction to our conversation, I don't take the fresh negotiation to have been the true object of this appointment. The meaning lies in the postscript which relates to yourself—I mean the second part of the conference. I have related it just as it passed; and as it was necessary for me to say something, I endeavoured to do no hurt. What I have said for your Grace, I have tried to put upon an honourable foot, whether a wise one or not is another consideration. ...Two observations I think occur upon it. One that the noble Lord wants to raccommode, and I dare say the place he has in his head is the President's....The other is that he himself does not think their peace in a hopeful way, but is frighted; and thinks that,

[1] The Bailli de Solar, Sardinian minister at Paris, through whom Bute conducted the secret negotiations with Choiseul. See above, p. 293.

[2] *I.e.* of the law.

if they get any peace, it will be such a one as will want all hands to support it. Thus I leave it....I should have told your Grace that nothing passed from his Majesty but common civilities....

[H. 73, f. 310; N. 256, f. 84.]

At Lord Bute's House, Wednesday, *July* 28, 1762.

Lord Bute began by saying that when he desired to have this opportunity of speaking to me, he wanted to give me some account of the state of the negotiation with France. Since that, some farther lights had been received by the letters which came on Saturday.

That as to France in particular, things seemed to be pretty near an agreement. They agreed to everything except S^ta^ Lucia; that our East India Company had lately desired that they might have the possession of the French comptoirs [trading centres] on the Ganges and would give the French Company an equivalent for them, to which the French ministers had declared they agreed; that by these last letters, France had desired that ministers might be sent on each side in order to negotiate and settle preliminaries, and had proposed epochs[1] for Europe, Asia, and America, but the periods they had proposed were too short.

I desired to know what those epochs were to relate to, but could not obtain a clear answer. But upon my mentioning the misfortune at Newfoundland[2], he said France agreed that everything which had been conquered on either side during *this negotiation* should be restored. If this be so, I should think the epochs can relate only to prizes to be taken. He said France proposed a general cessation of hostilities, as well by land as by sea.

I asked how far they were advanced with Spain, and whether Spain was to be included in this Treaty. He said Spain stood off, and had now sent an insolent memorial in the haughty style of that court, taking it for granted that we admitted that they had a right to fish on the Banks of Newfoundland; and as to the Bays of Honduras and Campeche, insisting that England should first quit and demolish all her establishments there, before they proposed any security for the Logwood Trade; that neither Spain nor France had said anything about Portugal, but the English ministers would insist upon that.

[1] *I.e.* for applying the principle *uti possidetis*.

[2] The French had succeeded in landing a small force at Placentia in Newfoundland, but they were soon expelled.

I suggested that the Duc de Choiseul had formerly declared that Spain might finally be included in the Treaty.

This he admitted, but said that now Monr de Choiseul was angry with Spain; had talked high to Grimaldi, and in a private letter to Monr Solar had said, "If Spain would not agree, England must force them to it"; that by several passages in such private letters, Choiseul had insinuated that France would not adopt the unreasonableness of Spain.

I flung out—But if a Treaty is made or preliminaries signed with France, and Spain not included, France may underhand assist Spain, either by land or sea, especially if the great number of their seamen prisoners here should be released; that it was not probable that France would throw away the advantage of her strict alliance with Spain.

His Lordship replied, France must stipulate not to assist Spain; but in that case, tho' preliminaries might be signed with France, he should not be for carrying anything into execution, as the recalling of troops etc:, till Spain should agree. (Here this remark is obvious that, if this should be practicable, yet the national expense must be continued.) This is the whole which I can recollect as to the negotiation.

After some pause his Lordship said that he was glad the other day to see the Duke of Newcastle look so well and in such good spirits; that he had been sorry to hear reports that he was uneasy.

I said I knew no grounds for such reports. He might possibly not be easy in respect of the Public, but I never knew him in better health and cheerfulness personally, in my life.

Lord Bute said that it had given him a great deal of uneasiness that his Grace had thought it necessary for him to leave the administration as he did; that he thought he could have gone on longer and better with him than with anybody else, for there was always a good humour about him, and he had not the starts and emotions that some others were liable to.

I said that I had conceived those hopes, and would not now pretend to enter into all the causes of the contrary event; that more communication and confidence might be necessary; and in the last instance I could not but wonder that things should be suffered to come to the extremity they did. How could the Duke of Newcastle go on, when he judged in his own department, the Treasury, a particular measure to be necessary that was opposed, and the gentleman who had the conduct of the King's affairs in the

House of Commons and who was supposed to bring the parole of the Court there [George Grenville], had declared that he would openly oppose it in debate; and all this, after it had appeared, even by Mr Martin's own paper, that more than £500,000 beyond the one million was necessary[1]?

His Lordship replied that Mr Grenville's opposing in the House of Commons would not have happened[2]; that as to Martin's paper, he had been mistaken and omitted several sums of which the Treasury might avail themselves; that it now appeared that the Treasury had money enough to go on very well.

I said I was very glad of it, and supposed in that case the Parliament would not meet till the usual time; to which he answered that it would not.

Lord Bute then said that he was sorry the Duke of Newcastle had not thought it proper for his situation to accept the King's Grace in what he had proposed to him at quitting; that if he should at any time think any office proper for his rank and age, the King would most readily confer it, and it would give him [Lord B.] the greatest satisfaction; that in respect of the Duke of Newcastle's friends, he had never intended any hostility against any of them; that he had carefully sought them out in the Treasury etc: in order to protect them.

I replied that to all this I could say nothing in particular. His Lordship interrupted by saying that he did not desire or expect an answer. I then went on, that thus far I would answer upon general knowledge, that the Duke of Newcastle was perfectly easy as to himself; pleased with his retreat and never more happy; that he laid his whole weight upon the concerns of the public only; that he and his friends adhered to the two grand points upon which the great difference had broke out viz: the support of the German war and the preserving of the connection with the King of Prussia, united as he is with the Emperor of Russia, and England's availing itself of both those persons in war and in peace; that the way to satisfy his Grace would be to satisfy him upon these national points.

My Lord Bute said that one thing which made him wish to

[1] Above, pp. 352 sqq.

[2] "I was surprised," writes Lord R. to his Father, "at Lord Bute's telling your Lordship now that Mr Grenville would not have opposed the Duke of Newcastle's vote of credit, when *he himself* [Mr Grenville] declared to Lord Barrington that he would have done it, and Lord B. has said the same thing to more than one person (I think the D. of Devonshire and Lord Mansfield) by way of excuse for not supporting the D. of N." H. 4, f. 261.

obtain a general peace with France and Spain at the same time, was to avoid distinguishing between the parts of the war about which people were so much divided.

I told him that nothing else would give satisfaction to the nation and make the King's government easy; that otherwise a nominal peace with France might be held out; but a contracted war, whether by striking off the German part, or by making peace with France only and continuing the war with Spain, would leave the nation still in hot water, create a strong jealousy and persuasion that France collusively assisted Spain and continue nearly the same burden.

He then talked of the mischiefs of these sudden rises and falls of the Funds, and so our conversation ended.

[The Duke in reply, on July 29 (H. 73, f. 320; N. 256, f. 108), reports a conversation with the Duke of Bedford, who had declared that the King had expressed the highest regard for the Duke of Newcastle, and had asked the Duke of Bedford whether the Duke of Newcastle would go into opposition.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 5; N. 256, f. 203.] CLAREMONT, *Aug.* 11, 1762.

...Lord Bute told the Duke of Devonshire that the Peace was agreed, sure or made, I can't exactly remember the expression. His Lordship then said the whole Council had been against him to a man. The Duke of Devonshire seemed surprised at that. "What, my Lord, your own Council?"—The Duke of Devonshire understood, and it is universally so reported, that my Lord Bute was for concluding immediately with France, the terms being now agreed and such as my Lord Bute related them to your Lordship, viz, S[t] Lucia given up to the French, and the line for the limits of Canada to be the course of the Mississippi as was proposed by us. Lord Granville, and the rest would not agree to that, or then, at that Council, to conclude any peace with France without proper security should be given that the French would not take part with Spain, in their war with us. And upon this, I apprehend, will be the difficulty, and it is this which creates the doubt in the City....

What an opportunity have our ministers lost through ignorance, obstinacy and a false notion of popularity? Had Prince Ferdinand been suffered and enabled to begin his glorious campaign one month or two sooner, and to have taken the advantage in time of the then happy event in Russia[1]; had we fixed the King of Prussia by our subsidy and thoroughly united ourselves with those Powers

[1] The accession of the Czar Peter. He had now been dethroned by his wife, the Empress Catherine, and was soon after murdered.

what a glorious peace might we have had? and probably a permanent system for Europe made afterwards, and even this fatal change in Russia might possibly have been prevented....

We in Surrey are all full of a very remarkable incident which happened at the assizes at Guildford which, I am persuaded, is the real sense of most of the country gentlemen in England. I shall relate the fact to your Lordship just as Mr Onslow[1] told it me, and afterwards told it to fifteen gentlemen who dined at Claremont on Sunday....

It seems it is the custom in Surrey for the High Sheriff to entertain all the gentlemen of the County, one day of the assizes. This High Sheriff...did so and had 120 of the first gentlemen to dine with him. After dinner he drank, standing, healths, which they call public healths, in full glasses. Those healths were all the royal family etc: and after them, standing still, their old member, Mr Onslow, and then your humble servant's health, in bumpers also. They then sat down, and everybody was to name his toast. The first toast named was Sir John Evelyn; that went round quietly. Then our friend, Mr Cartaret Webb[2], named my Lord Bute, upon which the whole company at once got up and would not drink it; there were not above two or three at most that drank it. This broke up the company. One Mr Coates, a very considerable wine-merchant, called out, "Who gave that toast? or proposed that health?" Mr Webb replied, "He is my master." The whole room was astonished and in great confusion, no one creature saying one single word for this toast.

I believe this is what never happened to any one man of his Lordship's quality before, and especially in such high favour and credit with the King. This must show what the spirit of the people is. It is, my Lord, his country (Scotland), and it will increase every day, notwithstanding the amazing influence which such unbounded power has over many of the first nobility, for *there* is the only progress which it has made.

Sure this circumstance must make an impression. Here could be no design, cabal, or intrigue; and must arise from the general opinion of the company. Tho' I daresay it will not happen, you may be assured that I shall endeavour to prevent it at Lewes, if I should hear of any such design....I hear the story is known and makes a great impression, and is much talked of....I propose when the Duchess of Newcastle is at the Duke of Leeds's to come and spend a day or two at Wimpole. Let my bed be laid in from this time....

[1] George Onslow (1731–1814), son of the late Speaker, M.P. for Surrey, afterwards Earl of Onslow.

[2] See note, vol. ii. p. 355.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Attorney-General

[H. 4, f. 265.] WIMPOLE, *Aug.* 21, 1762.

DEAR CHARLES,

Lord Lyttelton made me a visit on Thursday night, and stayed till just now....His Lordship said a great deal relating to yourself, very friendly you may be sure; that before he went last to Hagley his friend, Lord Egremont, had said much to him on your subject; that Lord Chancellor had complained to him of his health and that he could not go on in his office; that he wished the King and his servants would be thinking of a proper successor etc:; that on this occasion his Majesty had mentioned you and that you stood high in his opinion. [Lord Mansfield was quite out of favour.] I understood that this was thrown out as a lure to me, being of so great consequence to my family. I treated it superficially, but decently and civilly, and said nothing had been said about it to me. [Charles should visit Lord Bute, Lord Egremont and Lord Lyttelton.]

[Lord Lyttelton, Lord Hardwicke writes to the Duke of Newcastle concerning the same interview (N. 256, f. 325), was "loaded" by Lord Bute with compliments and regrets that they had left the cabinet[1].]

Attorney-General to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 5, f. 282; H. 80, f. 51.] *Sep. 3rd*, 1762.

...The matter of your lordship's kind letter by the messenger [of Aug. 21] did not surprise me. It coincided not only with what Woodcock[2] said, but with Lord President's random talk to me at Easter. As I really laid no weight upon it in my own mind, I never mentioned it to your Lordship, lest you should think I did. But he said much; and when I treated it slightly and that the King had choice of others, who were more fit, he said that it could be given to nobody else and that I must think of it.

I waited on Lord Lyttelton according to your Lordship's hint, last Sunday se'nnight, and found him alone. I affected to call by accident, not knowing whether he was returned from Wimpole, and to express my concern that I could not wait on him there, as one of the party. He soon entered into conversation, and went thro' all which Lord Egr[emont], Lord B[ute] and Lord Hal[ifax] had

[1] See also the account of Lord Lyttelton's subsequent interview with the D. of N f. 370 and H. 74, f. 22.

[2] Edward Woodcock, Secretary of Plantations.

said of the peace, etc. before his going to Wimpole. He professed the highest obligations to your Lordship, without whose generous friendship he should have fallen very low, especially as the Duke of Newcastle never attempted to support him; and instead of taking off the proscription, which had been set upon him, only made use of it as a pretence to do nothing for him[1].

When he entered on what related to myself, he threw it out as a thing fit for me to know, and founded on *facts*, which might serve in some degree to give light to my conduct, the King's good opinion and inclination, his intention (as Lord Egr[emont] had represented it) to offer me the *Great Seal*, in case of a vacancy; and that about Whitsuntide before Lord Lyttelton went last to Hagley, Lord Egr[emont] had spent three hours with him one evening, and talked very seriously upon it. I asked whether anything had been said since his return. He answered, No; Lord Chancellor was better, and the conversation had not been raised again. I then told him that I thought it better to let it sleep, and particularly not to own to Lord Egr[emont], or to any other person, that he had spoke to me upon it; and with that caution and restraint of secrecy and honour (which he promised) I would tell him what I thought of it; that if the proposition was seriously meant, it was founded on Lord Bute's sense of his own situation, as a Scotchman; but I feared that thro' the supposed weight of it with your Lordship and your family, it might be meant, in some degree, as the price of two impossibilities; one that Lord Bute should long continue where he is, and the other, that the Duke of Newcastle should be content, without returning to what he was.

As to the first, I said, that in every country the revenue, the law, and the clergy governed the State (the military did not, even in France, being fit only for a *coup de main*); and that if all these civil branches of administration fall into Scotch hands, it could not be tolerated; that particularly, as to the revenue, Scotland was so easy in respect to taxes (the whole burden lying on England), that an English House of Commons, who were proud of their power and superiority derived from wealth, would ill bear to see the revenue conducted by the Scotch, whom they have been used to consider only as hands in the King's purse, and no real supports to his throne; that besides this, the whole interior and provincial government depended much on the treasury; and the jealousy would soon rise, that great influence in elections would be applied to support Scotchmen in English boroughs, which would extend the representation of that country beyond forty-five members; at least it would depend on the arbitrary discretion of a Scotch minister and favourite, whether that influence should be so applied or not.

[1] Lord Lyttelton, once a close friend of Pitt, had disapproved of his conduct in opposition and had broken off relations and taken office in the D. of N.'s administration. He was left out on the reconstitution of the government in 1757 but made a peer through Lord H.'s influence.

As to the second, I thought that the Duke of Newcastle was so averse to return into any office of mere rank without power, that I doubted whether even your Lordship's weight and persuasion could bring him to it; especially as so many of his friends would think he lowered himself; tho' some, for their own sakes, even at the expense of his credit, would like the colour and protection of his name, to be in humour with the Court. I then said that, if the proposition was not serious, the meaning of it was only to induce me to take a part in the House of Commons with the new administration, particularly in support of their peace, and to make use of any little credit, which your family might have with some of the Duke of Newcastle's friends, to encourage others to act the like part.

With respect to the thing itself, I added, that if I could suppose the King would ever do me the honour hinted, I should not be afraid to accept it, tho' I should think it too early, and in many respects not eligible at this time. I enquired how Lord Mansfield stood, and whether he might not be thought of. He answered, that Lord Mansfield would feel nothing personal as to me, because he would see that it was impossible for him to have the Great Seal, *rebus sic stantibus*. His Lordship answered to a different point from what I meant. I meant to draw from him what he did not mention of the King's displeasure. For as to Lord Mansfield's feelings, they would be strong, but of no real consequence. His manner has been offensive and unpopular in Westminster Hall; and, as Sir Francis Bacon says, *perhaps I may improve, whilst others are at a stand.*

Lord Lyttelton said, that if such an offer came, I could not with honour refuse it; that my two impossibilities were certainly great difficulties; but as to the first, he thought Lord Bute's prudence with absolute favour might weather the conjuncture; and as to the second, that the Duke of Newcastle ought to reflect, he never could be a minister in power, as he had been in the late reign; and that it would be, above all, absurd for him to make himself the instrument of Mr Pitt's power, which would be the consequence of opposition. We parted on the strictest terms of caution. Upon the whole, I saw plainly that my friend had been moving, thro' Lord Bath and Lord Egremont, to acquire some consideration with the new minister, in which he had hoped not to be disapproved by you, and perhaps to make some merit to himself, if he could give hopes of any impression upon your Lordship. Of this conference I took not the least notice to the Duke of Newcastle, judging it quite improper; nor shall to any person living but Lord Royston and your Lordship.

I did not see Lord Bute till Monday last, by appointment, at eleven o'clock. To avoid personal coldness, I began with telling him that no occasion of business having brought me to him before, I had not had an opportunity of congratulating him on the honours which the King had conferred on him; that I could not wait upon

him at his levée, as others did, because the truth was, that in six years, since I was Solicitor-General, tho' the Duke of Newcastle had been twice in office, and twice out of it, I had never attended him in that manner. He said that was a trifle; he had had the honour of seeing others of my family, for whom he had a great regard, which was sufficient; that the weight and labour of his office was too much for him, unexperienced as he was.

I then went thro' my business about the plan for a board of ordnance in Ireland, in which I showed him some difficulties that pleased him as they might put an end to it. He studiously avoided mentioning the Duke of Newcastle or to say one word of his resignation, or your Lordship's not being summoned to Council; to prevent (I believe) my opening upon those subjects. Of his own accord he entered at once upon the peace, and supposed, in general, that I knew the terms; that he had desired Lord Lyttelton to acquaint Lord Hardwicke, and that he hoped that it would be to your satisfaction and agreeable to your ideas, when you attended the Council. Upon my saying that Prince Ferdinand had eased the negociation of what related to Germany by his conduct and success, he admitted it, but said the K. of Prussia would not open himself as to peace, tho' the King had repeatedly desired it.... He said that in order to compel Spain to treat, that Court had been told some time ago by our Ministers, if they delayed treating till news should come of the conquest of Havannah, it must be considered as an object of compensation....

On Wednesday I went to Claremont, and returned yesterday morning. The Duke of Newcastle received me very graciously, and showed me the letters and narratives of conversations, which had passed since I left your Lordship. As I determined to push his Grace a little beyond the half words and hints of his letters, I presumed to enquire what had passed with the Duke of Cumberland, which I took notice was not stated upon paper. He began with flattering me that his Royal Highness (from whom I never received any civility in my whole life) had spoke much of me, and of my reputation (as he was pleased to call it) with the Whigs in the House of Commons; and that I had spoke my mind on several occasions of late years with more freedom and weight than anybody; that the Duke of Cumberland was of opinion, the best plan of all would be that the Duke of Newcastle should go back to Court, at the Head of the Treasury, upon conditions explained, leaving Lord Bute there, as Groom of the Stole, or in some honourable station, if the King and his favourite could see the prudence of that measure for Lord Bute.

I observed that he went shortly to the conclusion, but what were the means proposed by his R. Highness? He said that the Duke's idea of conduct in Parliament, so far as the terms of peace were new since last year, was this; that the Duke of Newcastle was not bound to support but might object;...Santa Lucia given up, even tho' Martinique and Guadeloupe were in our hands, was too

much; Wesel and Cleves etc. not thought of[1]; that enquiries might be made, papers called for etc. etc. I answered, tho' Santa Lucia was something, yet I doubted how far these objects would strike in Parliament, weighed against the general expediency of a peace; especially what related to the King of Prussia in which the ministers would have much to say of his reserve and obstinacy. I said too that these were ideas of a plan for opposition; in that view, his own resignation must be followed by that which he had hitherto disavowed, the resignation of many of his friends. This consequence he admitted and said, "If his friends would have a Scotch minister and favourite, he would not disturb them in it, but that he believed the nobility and nation would not bear it." When I spoke of the King, and that few of those, who were young and going on in the world, would be forward to stake themselves upon a supposed personal point, he said "that if Kings would have their own way and do such things, they must be made to feel." I then said that his friends had made a mistake, who thought he meant retirement, and that he had advised himself ill in going out; for he would have fought with more advantage *in* than *out*; free from the appearances or imputation of faction; his side of the Court might have been considered as the sound part of the administration, and the other, as the Cabal; that if the work was to be done in this way, he might perhaps find it more tedious than he imagined with long speeches and late debates at his time of life: that personal objections to Lord Bute arising from measures and conduct, were not ripe enough to furnish parliamentary topics against him; that if Lord Bute saw a storm coming, he might go back to one of his former offices, and put some Englishman of quality, (as had been said) into the Treasury; that Lord Bute had conferred many obligations which would strengthen him, if not from a principle of gratitude, yet from a sense of shame; that an opposition would be difficult or impossible without Mr Pitt: (of whom I did not find he knew anything; at least it was not owned to me). I said that his Grace's points of opposition must be strong, his friends firm, and he must look distinctly to the end.

Would he choose to come into administration and return to the Treasury, whilst Lord Bute was absolute in favour? If so, in the nature of the thing, he could only return to his former state of uneasiness and indignities. Would he go into opposition with Mr Pitt (whom he had so long rejected or kept at a distance), in order to return with him into office? If so, Mr Pitt must be the minister. In measures he was so before; and Lord Bute being laid out of the case, he would be so in everything; for the Duke of Newcastle would not have strength enough, either in the King's personal inclination or natural temper, to resist as he had in the late reign, especially after having offended in opposition and proved the main instrument of bringing Mr Pitt back again.

I added that I only threw out these things for consideration

[1] Above, p. 373 and *n.*

without pretending to have any opinion, and resolved to follow my friends.

The Duke of Newcastle gave no direct answer to any of these things, dropped in different parts of our conversation, for the sake of trying him. So far he concluded rightly that he should see how things would turn out, whether the administration would have any and what peace, what the party in general thought nearer to the meeting of the Parliament; and that he should advise with your Lordship, and do as his friends would have him.

I do not presume to trouble your Lordship with any observations. I really have no fixed opinion and can have none. I write this stuff to rid my mind of it for the vacation, and to show your Lordship how I mooted with the Duke of Newcastle. Before the session of Parliament I shall know your judgment. If it is a measure to resign and I am to go *ad latus* of M^r^ Pitt, I shall incline strongly to attend the Bar no more, which I may *now* quit, without loss of honour in the world, and might perhaps attend hereafter with some profit, but more vexation. If I am to continue where I am, in this critical moment of my life, I am sure not to want your advice, and am most happy in the prospect, support and consolation of it, to inform me how I may tread with decency and honour upon the rotten ground of this administration....

Lord Royston, whom I shall visit tomorrow, and return to Highgate on Monday, will transmit this letter to Wimpole. He is so kind as to promise to think for me, and connect my ideas. But your Lordship must guide us both....I am always [etc.]

C. YORKE.

[On September 4, 1762 (N. 257, f. 145), the Duke of Newcastle gives an account of an audience with the King to which he had been summoned as the oldest K.G., to advise the King whether the ladies of the Knights might be allowed to wear the Garters on their arms.—After this important subject had been discussed, the King spoke at length on the terms of peace, beginning by saying] that there were many *stories* about me which he would not believe, that I would *attack this* and that I would *attack that*; that his Majesty had always replied that he knew me and my zeal for him, and that he would never believe anything of that sort of me *till he saw it.* [This was plainly in view of the violent spirit of opposition to the terms of peace lately shown in the City, and the Duke only replied that he hoped the King would never judge of him by reports, but only by his real actions. The King then proceeding, spoke of the peace as a necessity from the impossibility of carrying on the war; that France refused to treat without the cession of S^ta^ Lucia, to which the Duke replied that that shewed the value of the island to France and that, while he was in office, it was determined to secure some compensation for the cession of Martinico.] I then asked the King what was determined with regard to the boundaries and limits of Canada. He said that the French had not only consented

that the borders of the Mississippi should be the boundary...but that they would demolish all the forts etc: which they had upon the River Mississippi. (His Majesty was pleased to say up to the Ganges, but I apprehend the King mistook the Ganges for some other river.) As I am far from knowing exactly the state and limits of those countries, I said nothing further upon that head.—[In the margin] His Majesty was here under a mistake and confounded the boundaries of the Mississippi with what had been agreed with the French with regard to the East Indies....—[Then the King blamed the King of Prussia, who had rejected his offers of mediation with Austria and said] "What can I do? The King of Prussia will not open himself to me; I can do nothing but leave him to himself." [The Duke continues] I took that opportunity in the strongest manner, most earnestly to hope that this country would never be without some connection with the Continent; that the moment that should be the case, there would be an end of our superiority at sea, and the most fatal effects must happen to this country. His Majesty's answer was this, "I am entirely of that opinion, and have always been so." [Nothing had been absolutely settled with Spain, but the King said that Court seemed well-disposed. The Duke at the conclusion of the audience] told the King that, since H.M. had been so gracious as to give me this account, I thought in duty I was obliged to acquaint him that I apprehended it would be thought that some *compensation*, or *satisfaction*, should be given for the great successes of this year, and the very different situation that things were in everywhere when the terms of peace were under consideration the last year; that besides the great success of His Majesty's arms everywhere, the turn in Russia could not but be very advantageous to His Majesty and his allies...and that, tho' the present Empress might not go so far as the last Czar, we were, however, (I hoped) sure of a neutrality there;...that the Council had thought some additional satisfaction should be given for Martinico only; that in addition to that conquest, we thought ourselves now sure of the Havannah.

His Majesty made no objection to any part of what I had said, but rested the whole singly upon this, the impossibility of our carrying on the war, with some insinuations that he knew I had always been of that opinion. To which I replied that that was very true, but that the successes of this year had almost left nothing to be done; that France could stand out no longer, and that I thought those successes had even brought them to the disposition they were now in.

His Majesty was pleased towards the middle of this part of the conversation to say, "My Lord, I thank you for what you have said; you have done very rightly in giving me this information (or to that purpose), which I take to be a report of the opinion or thoughts of others, rather than your own."—

I easily saw with what view this was said. I made no reply, thinking it better to leave it there with having honestly and fairly

represented some of the objections which were made to the supposed terms of the peace....The King knew I was going to Wimpole, and when I was going away, ordered me in a most gracious manner, to make his compliments to my Lord Hardwicke and acquaint him with what His Majesty had been pleased to say to me.—I thought, however, that when I went out of the Closet, the King looked a little grave.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Attorney-General

[H. 5, f. 292; H. 4, f. 276.] WIMPOLE, Thursday, *Sep.* 9, 1762.

DEAR CHARLES,...

The Duke of Newcastle arrived here with my Cousin Jones, on Tuesday....His Grace has been in very good humour and appeared to be much pleased ever since. He has been very full of conversation and speculation (as you will easily imagine), and I have framed my discourse to him entirely upon the plan of your letter[1] without deviating from it in any one instance, and yet without letting slip the least hint or circumstance that could discover that I had received any intelligence or even heard from you, who are noted for a bad correspondent....

I laid it down as a thing beyond doubt, and brought the Duke of Newcastle to agree to it very explicitly, that no opposition could be formed with any probable hope of success without joining M^r^ Pitt in it, of whose disposition he positively declared that he knew nothing; that there is no ground at present for any public parliamentary opposition from measures, except such as may arise from objections to the conditions of peace; for that the unpopularity of *the Scotchman* could not in form be taken up in Parliament, till it broke out and was exemplified in material instances of conduct which were not yet ripened; that there would be a difficulty upon the Duke of Newcastle and his friends in shaping their opposition upon the conditions of peace (if made), because the popular run against the peace would be founded (as you said), not upon S^ta^ Lucia and upon Cleves and Wesel, but probably upon more material points, which had been agreed to whilst he and his friends attended the Council, and to these their supposed ally, M^r^ Pitt, would carry his objections. But still it might be replied, in case Prince Ferdinand should succeed in clearing Hanover and Hesse of the French, that all our acquisitions, except Canada and Senegal or Gorée, were given up without any equivalent, except Minorca

[1] Above, of September 3.

and Newfoundland[1], whereas last year Hesse and part of Hanover were put in compensation; that this way of reasoning would be much strengthened by restoring the Havannah, in case that should be taken; that in order to carry on this opposition several of our friends, who now remained in employments, must be induced to resign, for that they would not think it consistent with their honour to go into a general opposition, possessed of the employments and favours of the Crown; that tho' some of them might be induced to this, many of them would not, and indeed hardly any of them, without showing them hopes *in futuro* and holding out to them some prospect of success in a new administration.

This was to be the harvest; where were the labourers? I made the Duke of Newcastle go through the list of the House of Lords and we could find very few hands and fewer heads; as to speakers *to be depended upon*, reduced almost to his Grace and myself; as to me, *non eadem est aetas, non mens*; and as to himself, he must judge; that after having been used to ease, to rise and go to bed at our own hours, he always now between 10 and 11 o'clock, we should find it hard work to go thro' long and late debates, and all the uphill labour of an opposition, which we had never practised; that such a scene of fatigue would, at our time of life, probably demolish us in a twelvemonth; that after the whole gone through with the best success, M^r^ Pitt would be at the head of the new administration.

To all this his Grace agreed, or seemed to agree....You see how loose and vague all this is, the farthest in the world from any settled scheme....

From hence you may conclude that it is scarce probable that you will be put under the difficulty you apprehend about *resignation*, and this brings me to the only point in which I differ from you, I mean your idea of quitting the Bar; in case you should think fit to quit your office, which last I do by no means foresee. But, if it should so happen, my opinion upon consideration is that it would be inadvisable in the highest degree for you to leave the Bar. It will be giving up the most independent and, I think, the most advantageous profession in England, without any occasion; for you would not find your profits much lessened by the loss of your office, but you would find your own consideration and importance much diminished by the loss of your profession. My Lord Granville used to say that the first man at the Bar in opposition was equal to the first man upon the Bench. I don't carry it so far, but

[1] See above, p 403 *n*.

I really think the first man at the Bar *in opposition* is, *caeteris paribus*, equal to the first man at the Bar *in place*, and I always thought so. You have now my sincere opinion on this point....

I am, dear Charles, your most affectionate Father,

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke

[N. 257, f. 252.] CLAREMONT, *Sep.* 14, 1762.

...I spent three or four most agreeable days last week at Wimpole. My dear old friend was all I could wish, and I flatter myself we were happy in each other. I was charmed with your brother John; he sets you all hard with me. Lord Royston was so good as to come over to see me, and I had all the comfort and satisfaction which I could expect from him....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 257, f. 290.] *Sep.* 18, 1762.

...We have drove the French out of all North America; taken their most valuable islands in the West Indies, possessed ourselves of their settlements on the Coast of Africa, drove them absolutely out of the East Indies; have all to give to them and nothing to recover from them but Minorca, for which it ought to be supposed that Belleisle *singly* is more than a compensation....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 258, f. 11.] WIMPOLE, *Oct.* 2, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,...

Nobody can possibly rejoice more than I do at the glorious success of his Majesty's arms before the Havannah....I would have called it a *most important conquest*[1], if that word had not been turned into ridicule by the absurd application of it the last summer. I entirely agree with you for all the public reasons which you have given for its *importance*[2], and for three which I will not call *private*, tho' they are more *particular*. 1° That it strips certain persons of an objection which they would not have omitted, in case it had failed, and indeed they had already begun to make, I mean that the failure was owing to the council's not having concurred in M[r] Pitt's advice to fall upon Spain at the latter end of September

[1] Pitt's grandiloquent description of the capture of Belleisle.

[2] The D. of N.'s letter, H. 74, f. 50.

1761. 2° That it proves it to have been possible that an expedition of great consequence, extent and difficulty, might be well concerted and well executed without the counsel and consent of that gentleman. 3° What your Grace has hinted at in a very friendly manner, it does the greatest honour to the memory of poor Lord Anson, who had so great a part in the formation and direction of it. The French have a saying, *Les absents ont toujours tort*; more the dead; and I have seen that things were begun to be flung out, in order to have laid any ill success that might have attended it entirely at his door....Notwithstanding this, the sea-officers agree that the lights which he gave them and the charts which he furnished them with, did all prove right. Passing over some foibles (and no mortal man is without them) *take him for all in all* (as Shakespeare says), *I shall never see his like again* in that office....

[He deplores the state and conduct of the negotiations.]... I perfectly agree with your Grace that the conduct of the ministry with regard to their strong peace-making declarations has been highly blameable in respect of the Public and themselves too. I have heard but of *one person* named to have taken the dirty lucrative advantage, and he no minister except behind the curtain, but who has long ago prepared the world to believe anything of him[1]. The mischief arising to the Public by this conduct is evident; by *that* to themselves, I mean that by giving out such strong positive declarations of a *peace made* or *sure*, they have laid themselves under the greater necessity of concluding a peace, and consequently given France an advantage over them in the negotiation, as Queen Anne's ministers did in the Treaty of Utrecht. [He has the worst forebodings. Surely all mankind must expect that some compensation for this important success should be obtained. The Duke of Cumberland's attitude was very satisfactory, and he was glad to see some softening with regard to M^r^ Pitt.]

[On October 3, 1762 (N. 258, f. 28), the Duke of Newcastle gives the substance of a conversation which he had had with the Duke of Cumberland on October 1, at Windsor, who expressed his strong disapprobation of Lord Bute's "sole power" and the exclusion of the old supporters of the Royal family. Fox had told him that Lord Bute was in favour of agreeing immediately to the Preliminaries, without asking any compensation whatever for the Havannah, but was opposed by George Grenville, who proposed to Lord Bute that the Duke of Devonshire, the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke should be invited to attend the council to assist in the

[1] Fox, *i.e.* by stock-jobbing.

discussion, a proposal which was rejected. At length, however, finding the opinion of the ministers against him, Lord Bute had yielded and had sent orders to the Duke of Bedford at Paris to demand an equivalent. From hence Fox had inferred that it was impossible for Lord Bute to go on, when he "could not govern his own people," and had only one friend in the council, Lord Halifax; and it was reported that Lord Bute himself had said that he should be glad to have his Gold Key again. The Duke of Cumberland had expressed his strong disapproval of several particulars in the peace to the King. The Duke of Newcastle had enquired in the city, and had ascertained that money could probably be procured for carrying on the war on its original plan for another year, provided a minister of ability and stability were placed at the treasury and the inadequate terms of peace rejected.

The Duke of Newcastle continues on October 7 (H. 74, ff. 61 and 63; N. 258, f. 82) There was scarcely one article in the proposed treaty which ought to stand. He "had reason to think" that Lord Bute had said] that he was very glad of our success at the Havannah, but that he wished it had not come so soon by two or three days; that is, in other words, that we had concluded a peace without taking the advantage of it. I believe such a thing was never said before by an English minister; but they copy the treaty of Utrecht throughout....I beg your Lordship will consider what the Havannah is and the consequences of the glorious conquest we have made. By being in or keeping possession of the Havannah we are absolutely masters of all the treasures of the Spanish West Indies, and it is impossible for them to get it back again till they have a superior naval force to ours, not even in conjunction with France, and the blow which my friend Albemarle and Pocock[1] have given to them in that respect, having transferred from their navy to ours thirteen good, large ships of the line, of which, I hear, eight are, or will be soon, coming to England with the immense treasure in money of one million and a half sterling, will at least put a stop to them for some time. In this situation can any friend to the public make a voluntary cession of the Havannah and of the hank we have over Spain by it?...I think we were in the wrong by breaking off the negotiation with France last year in Mr Pitt's time. I thought so then, but since it is broke off, since we have been obliged from thence to raise and spend near twenty millions sterling, [since Hanover had been cleared of the enemy, Martinico conquered from the French and the most valuable possession of the Spaniards wrested from them, surely the terms now should not be the same. Continuing in a secret letter, he complains of being misunderstood both by his enemies and his friends; he repudiates the motives of restless ambition and jealousy ascribed to him. No power on earth should make him a responsible

[1] George Keppel, third Earl of Albemarle, and Admiral Sir George Pocock, who had commanded the successful expedition against Havannah.

minister again; but at the same time he will not be "treated as an old piece of household stuff that they may do what they please with." His wish is to be called to the council with Lord Hardwicke and the Duke of Devonshire without office, provided that Pitt and Legge took the principal parts in the administration].

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 258, f. 120.] WIMPOLE, *Oct.* 9, 1762.

[Approves of the Duke of Devonshire's refusal to attend the council.] The beginning of your Grace's narrative of the substance of your material conversation, so far as it relates to Mr Fox, is very extraordinary. I thought the Duke [of Cumberland] had been convinced that that gentleman had left him for my Lord Bute, but he is very capable of being a double spy and in that capacity, I presume, he now acts. [He discusses in detail the articles of peace, as far as they were known from the Duke of Cumberland's account, and proceeds:] As to the present administration, if my Lord Bute cannot make a peace that can be supported in the nation, there must be an end of him. His want of weight and power amongst his fellow-ministers has the appearance of a fatal symptom for him. If he really said, "that he should be glad to have his Gold Key again," it is the most sensible thing that I have heard some time.

There now remains the point of your Grace's *own subject and situation*; and I am sure I need not assure you that nobody can more affectionately and ardently wish that it may be such as may make you quite happy, than I do. But it is my duty to speak to you on this subject with the freedom of sincere friendship. You say that "you have the misfortune to be misunderstood by all your enemies and, in one respect, by some of your best friends, by the first as never being easy without being at the head of affairs and leaving no equal or rival." But, if these enemies of yours could think reasonably, they would be convinced of the injustice of this by what your Grace submitted to with Mr Pitt at the latter end of the late reign, and what you have submitted to with Lord Bute during all this reign.

By the latter viz. some of your best friends, "that your real wish is to return to Court and your old employment," pardon me, my dear Lord, for saying that I fear a handle is taken for this imagination from your constantly thinking and talking so much about arrangements of this nature. The last morning which you

did me the honour to spend here, you said to me in your own room with a very commendable frankness, "that you did not know but you thought too much about it." I laid hold of that expression, and took the liberty to say *that I thought so too*; that there was no use in it; it only heated your imagination and did harm. And I am confident that is one great ground of the opinion which has gone about, and which you complain of.

Your Grace says that "no consideration on earth shall make you a responsible minister in any degree, or at least a principal one"; and then you propose a middle scheme, viz. "to have no employment, to be called with the Duke of Devonshire and your humble servant to council, and to be consulted in the direction of affairs and disposition of employments, but that in this both Mr Pitt and Mr Legge must be principal parts," and that you will write more fully to me upon it. Forgive me, my dear Lord, for saying that will be quite an unnecessary trouble; for I am thoroughly convinced that such a scheme is absolutely impracticable. For your Grace, or all three of us, to be called to council is very practicable; but that any persons, who are to be the responsible ministers, will lay themselves under an obligation to consult three or two persons out of employment, in the direction of all affairs of state, and more especially in the disposition of places and employments, is a thing not to be supposed. Whoever those ministers shall be, if they are to be responsible, they will expect the same unfettered powers which their predecessors have enjoyed; but such a stipulation would be, as it were, to put the disposition of places and employments into commission, which can never be. If it were to be tried, I am confident it would not last three months. And how does your Grace think that Mr Pitt would quadrate with it, if he were to be one of the ministers? To say all that I think in a few words, I am clearly of opinion that, if your Grace means to be in business again, there is but one of the two following ways to be taken,...either for you to take the Treasury again, or to procure some friend of your own to be put at the head of the Treasury on whom you can rely, and for you to accept some great office of dignity and profit, as my Lord Sunderland did[1]. Whether this can be done I don't pretend to say, but I am sure nothing else will do.

Your Grace lays a weight on having a share in the disposition

[1] Robert Spencer, second Earl of Sunderland, the able but mischievous statesman of Charles II and James II. On William's accession he obtained the post of Lord Chamberlain.

of employments "out of regard to the party, and to be able to reward those who are unrewarded at present." This is very generous in you, but really, if that were the whole or the principal part of the affair, I cannot but think that you have done your part already, and that there are not many *outstanding debts*.

But I have gone further than I intended, and have quite tired myself. If I have said anything too freely, I beg you will pardon it for the uprightness of the intention, for I quite agree with your Grace in your conclusion—to wait to see the great result of the negotiation of peace, and the method, in case of its failure, that these ministers will propose for carrying on the war....

I am with the most unfeigned affection, my dearest Lord,

ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

[On October 17, 1762 (N. 258, f. 258), Lord Hardwicke expresses his astonishment at the resignation of George Grenville who refused to defend the peace in the Commons, which must have a bad effect abroad and on the negotiations, and proceeds:] What a fine scrape has this gentleman led his great friend into! He was the principal instrument in breaking the last administration and now has broke this....He has appeared to me always to have flinched at any particular terms of peace, and therefore to have preferred a contracted plan of war....I make no doubt but Mr Grenville's reasons were his aversion to the terms of peace, and his fears of taking upon him the defence of it in the House of Commons. Your Grace knows I never thought that he would dare to stand Mr P[itt]'s fire there, and you may depend upon it that apprehension has been a great ingredient in the present case.

As to the gentleman who has been called upon, in so handsome a manner[1], to supply that vacuum in St Stephen's Chapel, I will venture to pronounce beforehand, it will never do.—Neither his talents, his character, his firmness to his convictions, nor his health are sufficient for it. The *great man* said truly in a former case, about this time twelvemonth, that it would be putting the most unpopular man in England in the place of the most popular one[2]. This would be to set up the most unpopular man in England in opposition to the most popular one, to support the most unpopular measure....

I agree with all your Grace has said about the importance of

[1] Fox. H. 74, f. 81.

[2] See above, p. 328 *n.* 2.

our conquest of the Havannah, and the necessity of having a material and substantial compensation for giving it up....

I have now seen several experiments made in different administrations of setting up a chief or leader in the House of Commons by dressing up somebody with the supposed credit of the Court, without being invested with some proper ministerial office in his own person, and have always seen it fail. I am now convinced that it will never succeed in these times. I wonder one thing has not been attended to, that nothing will inflame or stimulate Mr Pitt's opposition more than the opposing Mr Fox to him....

[On October 21, 1762 (N. 258, ff. 274, 303, 332; H. 74, f. 87), the Duke of Newcastle sends long accounts of interviews he has had with Lord Halifax on October 16 and with the Duke of Cumberland on October 19.—The former, by the King's wish, once more urged the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke to return to the ministry and made use of every argument and persuasion, including some hints that in case of a refusal the Duke's supporters might lose their places. He only met, however, with a firm negative. In the Duke of Newcastle's interview with the Duke of Cumberland, H.R.H. had given him an account of a conversation with Fox, who had now joined Lord Bute's ministry without office, as leader of the House of Commons with the control of the patronage. He appeared greatly delighted with his new situation, but H.R.H. had expressed to Fox his strong disapprobation of the step and of Lord Bute's exclusion of the old ministers. To Fox's suggestion that H.R.H. should be appointed to the chief command of the army, he had replied with contempt. Lord Bute had complained extremely of the return made by the Duke of Cumberland to the King's advances and marks of confidence, though H.R.H. had only done his duty. Fox founded his hopes alone upon the strength and weight of power, and his own resolution to exert it under my Lord Bute.] Mr Fox finding the Duke of Cumberland in this very determined way and so much displeased with him, said, "Will your Royal Highness shut your doors against me?" H.R.H. replied very coolly that his doors were always open to everybody, or to that purpose. [With regard to future conduct, H.R.H. thought an amendment to the Address should be moved, expressing the willingness of the House to support the war for another year, in case a peace now were found impracticable. In his own letter to Lord Hardwicke the Duke of Newcastle enters once more upon the great subject of the conduct of the Whig lords and the Duke of Cumberland in the circumstances.—Nothing, in his opinion, could be done without Pitt.] But how to get at him is the question; he is very delicate, very nice; and I should not be surprised if he has made a plan for himself to let things run on,

the ministers destroy themselves and he, once more, to come in *unconnected to serve this poor country.* But in that case, he may come too late. [The only man, through whom advances might be made to Pitt, was the Attorney-General.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 258, f. 368.] WIMPOLE, *Oct.* 23, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

...I make no doubt but my Lord Bute has been encouraged by Mr Fox to try to support himself by *power* only. It is his principle....But I will venture to prophesy that *power* to be executed and carried through by such hands as Mr Fox will be more unpopular and felt with more resentment than in most others, which could have been chosen....I am far from being convinced that a scheme so ill-digested and heterogeneous can be launched and carried into execution—[Lord Halifax's propositions, he considers, to be totally devoid of substance and solidity. Regarding Pitt] the Attorney-General must judge for himself, but my own opinion is that he has not weight and credit enough with him in the present circumstances for such a negotiation. Your Grace adds that, if Mr Pitt has any resentment against anybody, it is primarily against you. I am far from being convinced of that....But admitting for a moment this to be true, the objection will hold equally strong against Charles, and...he would look upon one of my family as only the conduit-pipe to convey to him what your Grace shall dictate. [The Duke of Devonshire, who once formed a ministry with Pitt, would be a far better choice.] Since the altercations which we had with that gentleman [Pitt] in council the last year, and in which I perhaps weakly, (considering how we were supported) took so great a share, I am sure he is much offended with me, and therefore I should be a most unfavourable negotiator. But I will explain myself further. I am ready to take any part in Parliament, which the good of the Public or the honourable support of my friends shall require, so far as my health will permit me to attend. But I cannot go through the like task as I underwent in the summer of 1757, by way of treaty and making arrangements for a new administration to be compounded of parts discordant with and jealous of one another. I cannot now bear those attendances, long meetings, late hours at night, and all the agitations of mind attending them. My health and strength will not enable me to do it. I thought I owed it to your Grace to

say this much, because I am firmly determined not to undertake this part.

[The Duke of Cumberland's replies to Fox were extremely wise and worthy of him, but it was surprising that Fox's conduct to such a patron had not aroused even more indignation.] I...hasten to what you have more than once summoned me to in your letter, I mean an opinion upon the whole. I thought I had more than once given your Grace my opinion, and shall do it now; but forgive me, my dear Lord, for saying that I can by no means agree to what you say, "that you shall not advise, being determined to follow and not to lead." Who shall advise or who shall lead, unless the person who has all along been at the head of us and led us?

I cannot persuade myself that my Lord Bute's uniting himself with Mr Fox alters much the state of the case, or adds real strength to the ministry. Their great want was *popularity*, instead of which they have taken up *unpopularity*....Your final question is, what ought to be done? I am the worst judge in the world in such cases, but I will tell you what I think. It is impossible for you at present to open any particular specific plan of opposition to your friends, because that must depend upon events—peace or no peace, and if peace, what shall be the conditions of it; and, if war, how proposed to be carried on. Therefore my poor opinion is, to induce your friends to keep themselves free from engagements with those gentlemen, and to parry their closetings with general answers; to procure them to attend at the first meeting of Parliament; and, as to the meetings of both Houses the night before the Parliament, I like very well your *middle way*, to let those in employment, who choose to be absent, be so (and I believe Mr Fox's being in the chair will keep some away), and to contrive that all your country independent friends should know that their not appearing there would, in your opinion, have a very good effect.

I like also the idea of an addition to be made to their Address the first day of the session. But this will much depend upon the nature and turn of the Speech and Address....

May God direct us all for the good of this country, which is the essential point!...

Duke of Newcastle to the Attorney-General

[N. 259, f. 18.] CLAREMONT, *Oct.* 25, 1762.

DEAR SIR,

If ever I had occasion for the advice and assistance of my best friends, it is at present. They are confined now to very few, your Father, Lord Royston and yourself, the Duke of Devonshire, and, as far as it is decent for me to make use of that expression, the Duke of Cumberland....[He sends the narratives of his interviews. The consequences of Fox's junction with Lord Bute would be other than those at first supposed. It had aroused none of the expected hostility in the Press or the City.]...My Lord Bute has the sole power of this kingdom. He is, and has been, determined to exert it to the utmost and depend singly upon it....He does not know how to make use of that power. He has therefore (wisely for his purpose) chose the man in the world who will stick at nothing, and is both willing and able to try the full extent of that power. No man knows better than he does the weakness and wickedness of mankind, or to make the best use of it. He sees already that power has influenced many, and staggered many more, whom he vainly flatters himself he shall fix and determine by the manner, in which he (Mr Fox) shall exert it.

He published everywhere that the Duke of Newcastle's friends (many) are gone over to my Lord Bute....He will begin by sounding everybody and turning out some for examples. He has agents working everywhere. He knows whom to employ, and how to work upon different dispositions and constitutions.

These are the reasons which make me think that my Lord Bute has done *ably* for his purpose in the choice he has made....If the necessity of the Public (which I can't believe) or if the opinion of my friends, should be to acquiesce and let these gentlemen establish themselves and rule this country with a rod of iron, I can and will submit. But it shall never be said that upon any proposal or inducement whatever, I will make a part of an administration to support the absolute sole power of a Lord of Scotland, ignorant in business, unexperienced in the manner of carrying it on, delegated to be executed solely by Mr Fox; I should be ashamed of myself if I did, and shall be ashamed of all those who do or shall do it.

Having said thus much with regard to myself, I must at the same time desire to know what my friends will do. I can no longer keep in suspense or amuse those who are ready to take part with us, if we have ourselves no part to take. I shall say this very plainly to the Duke of Devonshire and to my Lord Hardwicke, and in a proper manner to the Duke of Cumberland.

The first great question is, whether to attend Mr Fox's meeting or not? I wonder, indeed, that that is a question. The next—what (if any) motion or alteration should be made in their supposed Address? That cannot be determined till the Speech and Address

are known.—What part Mr Pitt will act, I know not. I hear from good hands that he says nothing will be done....The Duke of Devonshire is at the Bath, my Lord Hardwicke at Wimpole, and the Duke of Newcastle will do nothing (and there he is in the right) without those two. Is this an appearance of doing anything? and I can't but say, Mr Pitt reasons as every man of sense will do, and must do.

I have no secret from my Lord Hardwicke, my Lord Royston and yourself. I beg therefore you would communicate these packets and this letter to my Lord Royston. I wish his Lordship and you together would come down here on Saturday morning next that I may talk them over to you, if it was only for one hour.

It is absolutely necessary that something should be determined soon. I cannot satisfy my friends without it. If that is not now done, Mr Fox will be in the right; they will, many of them, go over to my Lord Bute.

I am dear Sir, etc:

... HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Lord Royston to the Attorney-General

[H. 13, f. 33.] RICHMOND, *Oct. 27th*, 1762.

...For my part, I have hitherto formed no decisive...[opinion], and think the crisis a very difficult one for our friends to act in. The measures of government must surely determine our conduct. I do not think it will be for the Duke of Newcastle's or Lord Hardwicke's credit to set themselves at the head of a weak opposition, nor am I very fond of a junction with the D[uke] of C[umberland], and truly, as to Mr Pitt, I have tasted enough of him. I will return your letter by some safe hand....It is of a piece with all His Grace's productions, not having the patience to let events work out themselves, and seeking out for sense too from all quarters but where a real great man should find it, in his own breast. Let Lord Bute and Mr Fox alone for 6 months and I will answer for it, they will be unpopular enough; but I am far from saying they will not be able to find ministerial support....

[Charles Yorke in reply (f. 39) writes:—] Our old friend, the Duke of Newcastle, is an entire stranger to anything but the ambition of a Court, without wisdom to attain the end or opportunity to create the means of that ambition.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 97; N. 259, f. 114.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Oct.* 28, 1762, at night.

MY DEAR LORD,

Your Lordship will be, I am sure, surprised at a very extraordinary event that happened this day. The Duke of Devonshire came to town this morning and I was to meet him here at dinner. His Grace went to Court as usual, and desired to speak to the King as usual also[1]. *The Page* came out and told the Duke of Devonshire *that the King would not see him, and ordered him (the Page) to tell him so.* My Lord Duke upon that desired the Page to ask the King to whom his Majesty pleased that he should deliver his Staff. The King sent him word by the same *Page* that *H. M. would send him his orders.* My Lord Duke has since delivered his Staff and Key to my Lord Egremont, and goes tomorrow early to Chatsworth. He behaves in every respect like a gentleman and an honest one as he is. I shall not reason upon this by letter. I hope you will be in town on Monday.

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 99; N. 259, f. 185.] CLAREMONT, *Nov.* 1, 1762.

...I believe no Court in Europe (I will scarce except Russia) ever put such an affront upon one of the first rank, consequence and merit, as the Duke of Devonshire is, in this country, and with regard to this Royal Family.

Indeed, my dear Lord, these violences are very alarming; and the more as in this instance, they are exercised upon one who, the very last time the King saw him, at the Installation[2], was treated by His Majesty with the greatest seeming confidence and regard; and I know the Duke of Devonshire went to the Bath under the delusion that he was personally particularly well with the King and never heard otherwise from the Court, till he met with this treatment at S[t] James's.

If this affront is put upon the Duke of Devonshire, what are others to expect from it? It is a most melancholy consideration. Your Lordship knows that I have long feared that no violences would be omitted, which could tend to establish the sole power of the minister, and I doubt not but this is done *as a warning to others.*

[1] In a letter to Lord Rockingham (N. 259, f. 112) the D. of N. writes "I believe (between you and me) with a design to resign the Staff; but that neither I nor any mortal knew, and I am sure was not suspected by the King or my Lord Bute."

[2] Of the Knights of the Garter.

There is one circumstance that the Duke of Devonshire told me, which, he thinks, may possibly have brought it on, and that is this. When M^r^ Fox notified his promotion and exaltation to the Duke of Devonshire at Bath, his Grace wrote him a very severe answer, reproaching him with having abandoned all his old friends, principles and connections; and that to be the agent of or deputy to a sole minister of whom, I am afraid, the Duke did not give a very favourable description. I never saw any man more enraged and with reason than the Duke is; and I think the part he took at S^t^ James's and afterwards in going to my Lord Egremont, was the most proper, the most spirited and indeed the quickest and best judged that he could have taken. He declares at present that he will never go to Court again, and has already forbid all his relations, men and women, to go there.

The great question is what our joint friends should do upon this occasion....To add to the indignity, that message [was] sent by a poor Page, who was ashamed and afraid to give it....

[On November 2, 1762 (N. 259, f. 206), the Duke of Newcastle gives an account of an interview with the Duke of Cumberland that day. H.R.H. was "extremely affected" with the treatment of the Duke of Devonshire. He had seen Fox once more, and had replied severely to his attempts to cajole and deceive.] "The King," Fox had said, "upon meeting the Duke of Devonshire and the Duke of Newcastle [driving] upon the road that day had said, 'the Duke of Devonshire can come up to cabal against me, tho' he can't attend my Council when I require it.'"

His Royal Highness took it up very high, as it affected him personally, who had so great a regard for, and such great obligations to, the Duke of Devonshire; that the nobility might make a common cause of it and think it may be their turn next.—M^r^ Fox answered, "That may be so; *some few* great Lords may be offended," but insinuated that in other respects it might have an effect. He told the Duke that the King had said, "that he would never admit the Duke of Newcastle into his closet as long as he lived." The Duke replied; "Pray M^r^ Fox, how can this be? This surprises me very much; for I have heard a very different account. Did not my Lord Halifax *go to the Duke of Newcastle and hold a very contrary language to this*[1]?" M^r^ Fox rather pleaded his ignorance of anything of that kind....[The Duke of Cumberland had offered to have an interview with Pitt to secure his support, which was indispensable.]

[1] On October 16 Lord Halifax had proposed to the D. of N. his own and Lord H.'s return to office, of which Fox was probably not informed. See also above, p. 423.

Conversation between Mr Pitt and Mr Nuthall[1], *November* 5, 1762, *as related by Mr Walpole*[2] (N. 259, f. 277; H. 74, f. 103).

Obliged for the communication of the notice that had been taken of him and thought himself much honoured by it, and was ready to communicate his sentiments on public affairs.

Had seen persons of the country party who[m] he never expected within his doors; had given answers that could not be agreeable. That whatever the Peace might be, bad or good, the nation would never bear Lord B[ute]'s transcendency of power.

Favour and honours might be allowed, but not within the walls of the Treasury.

Called the behaviour to the Duke of Devonshire madness; asked what the nobility thought of such an indignity, whether they would not resent it.—What the Duke of Newcastle's friends would do....That a great plan was necessary, and was ready to concur in measures with the Duke of Newcastle; whether he would again come into the Treasury and what his Grace's views and intentions were; for some plan must be settled.

Was enraged at the report of his having approved the Preliminaries and that it was said he would not attend Parliament before Christmas; that the indiscretion of his friends hurt him as much as the malice of his enemies; that tho' the nation bore him on their shoulders, he could accept of no office whilst the K[ing] had the opinion he had conceived of him.

Upon being told Lord Bath avowed the violent steps which have been lately taken, said his Lordship was damning his country with his latest breath.

An account given by Mr Walpole of what passed with Mr Pitt, November 13, 1762 (N. 260, f. 1; H. 74, f. 118).

M[r] Pitt entered into a long discourse of his conduct at the latter end of his late Majesty's reign and during his present Majesty's to the time of his resignation, when he was reduced to such a situation, that out-Toried by Lord Bute and out-Whigged by the Duke of Newcastle, he had nobody to converse with but the clerk of the House of Commons.

That lately he had been applied to by persons of high rank to concur with Lord Bute for the public good, with offers much above his deserts, and therefore he was ashamed to mention them.

He told those persons Lord Bute could never expect he would abet the transcendency of power his Lordship was arrived at, after what had passed between them upon that subject, on the day of his Majesty's accession to the throne, when in a private conversation with his Lordship, M[r] Pitt told him his advancement to the

[1] Thomas Nuthall (d. 1775), Pitt's solicitor and confidant.

[2] Hon. Thos. Walpole, second son of Horace, Lord Walpole.

management of the affairs of this country, would not be for his Majesty's service[1].

Upon Lord Bute taking the Seals, Mr Pitt having never seen Lord Bute in private since the day above mentioned, his Lordship came to acquaint Mr Pitt with his promotion and received the same opinion as before, that Mr Pitt did not think it for his Majesty's service. And that now his Lordship was arrived at fulness of power, he could not bear with the Duke of Devonshire, but insulted the nobility, intimidated the gentry and trampled on the people, [and] he (Mr Pitt) would never contribute to that yoke Lord Bute was laying on the neck of the nation.

He said if others had been as firm as himself, things would not have been brought to their present crisis; that he did not well see what was to be done; that the Duke of Newcastle, Duke of Devonshire and Lord Hardwicke had been so much disposed to a peace. The peace was now come and seemed to be final....

Mr Pitt then returned to the domestic part, expressing his apprehension that the distinction of Whig and Tory was rising as high as ever; that he lay under great obligations to many gentlemen who had been of the denomination of Tories, but during his share in the administration had supported government upon the principles of Whiggism and of the Revolution; that he would die a Whig and support invariably those principles, yet he would concur in no proscriptive measures, and tho' it was necessary Lord Bute should be removed from the office he now held, he might not think it quite for his Majesty's service to have the Duke of Newcastle succeed there, begging that this might not be thought to proceed from any resentment to the Duke of Newcastle, for whose person he had real regard and true esteem of his abilities, and who perhaps might have as much cause to complain of Mr Pitt, as Mr Pitt of his Grace.

With regard to himself, he had felt inexpressible anxieties at holding office against the good will of the Crown; that he would never put himself again in that situation, nor accept of any employment whilst his Majesty had that opinion of him, which he was acquainted with....

Rev. Thomas Birch to Lord Royston

[H. 52, f. 26.] LONDON, *Nov.* 13, 1762.

MY LORD,...

What the people in general think of the peace, as the preliminaries are not yet thoroughly known, it is difficult to say: but it is remarkable that since the certainty of the signing of them the Stocks are five per cent. lower than they were yesterday sennight, when there was only a rumour of it.

[1] But see above, pp. 265, 305.

Amongst the resigners one, who was least expected to be of that number, is Lord Kinnoull, who on Thursday, after having been at Newcastle House (where there was a very large Levée, as the Bishop of Lincoln, who was there, told me), gave notice to Lord Egremont of his intention to resign the chancellorship of the Duchy[1]....

Lord Bute's reception in the City in his passage thro' it to Guildhall on Tuesday was such that it would have been much more prudent for him to have spared his visit; and he seems to have been deceived by his flatterers into an opinion that he was much less unpopular than he has now reason to think he is. As soon as it was known who he was, he was entertain'd with a general hiss; and if some accounts are true, his chariot was pelted, on each side of which the two famous bruisers, Broughton and Stevenson, are affirmed to have walked as a guard to him, tho' I can scarce credit it. It is certain that in the Hall he was very coldly received and sat for some time in a corner of the Council Chamber, alone, with all the appearance of gloom and confusion in his countenance. In short, the whole dinner passed with much less cheerfulness than has been known on such an occasion, and his Lordship thought proper to return, not in his own chariot, but in Lord Mansfield's coach, to escape observation....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[H. 74, f. 122; N. 260, f. 15.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov.* 15, 1762.

[He fears that on the point of resignations the Duke's wishes will not be satisfied. Lord Kinnoull had resigned, and that was all that could be expected of him.] I take the account which he gave your Grace, how people begin to reason about the Duke of Devonshire's affair, to be a very true one. Amongst the few I have seen I have found it myself. They are very sorry for it, they censure it strongly, but it is a single act and a private act, and the affairs of the public are not to be thrown into confusion on that account; they are sure the Duke of Devonshire himself would not wish it. But, be that as it may, it is no reason for them to resign their employments. Thus I find people satisfy themselves, and I never doubted but it would be so amongst people in lower stations and ranks. For in truth, my dear Lord, I never thought that a measure of opposition could be founded on this act (tho' nobody can think it more offensive and outrageous than I do), unless a number of *the great nobility* would take it up in a high tone and make it their own cause, in which case persons in the House of Commons, brought into Parliament by them or dependent upon

[1] See N. 259, ff. 333, 352.

them, would follow their leading. But by what your Grace tells me in the sequel of your letter, I do not find that the great nobility (except the Marquis of Rockingham) seem at present disposed to hold that conduct.

How my Lord Kinnoull had heard that "no one of my Lord Hardwicke's family would resign," I cannot imagine; for I am sure I never said anything like it, nor do I believe that any one of my family has said so. But as I perceive the view (a very right one) with which your Grace has inserted this passage in your letter, I think it incumbent upon me to speak a little more plainly on that topic. This question concerns three of my younger sons. They are all of years of discretion (the youngest of them being three and thirty), capable of judging for themselves, and two of them have families. I shall therefore *not insist* upon their resigning, but when that point shall be ripe for the members of the House of Commons, I shall recommend it to them to consider seriously and determine for themselves. I may be partial, but I think they have sense, and also principles of virtue and honour, and will act as becomes them in such circumstances. But I will never compel them by my *commands* or *advice* to do what it will probably never be in my power, at my time of life, to assist them to retrieve.

When your Grace resigned in 1756, I quitted with you. I never once regretted it but am proud of it, tho' no other of your friends did the same. Had I been in place when you quitted the last summer, I should have taken the same part; but all this is of a different consideration....

I find people in general, even our most particular friends, much inclined to peace and determined not to oppose upon that head, provided it comes out to be admissible. They allege that in this point they followed your Grace when in; that you instructed and convinced them that it was absolutely necessary and they cannot contradict themselves. Here I beg leave to make an observation, that this will create the greatest difficulty in forming an opposition in conjunction with M^{r} Pitt. Unless some greater faults should appear, he will attack the Peace upon points which we, whilst of the Council, agreed to, viz. the Fishery, restoring both Martinique and Guadeloupe and Gorée etc....

Your Grace is no stranger to my sentiments concerning your entering into so intimate a correspondence *in that quarter* [the Duke of Cumberland], and likewise in another *of kin to it* [Princess

Amelia]. Nobody can have a greater respect for both of them than I have, but I always foresaw that it would end in drawing you into future disquiet and uneasinesses; whereas you resigned with desiring your friends not to quit and creating expectations, tho' not with any declaration, that you meant not to enter into a general opposition but to retire. I beg your Grace will look back into the letters which I have had the honour to write to you this summer, more especially to one of the 10th of May and another of the 28th of May last, because they relate particularly to the point I am now upon[1]. The latter is the letter I desired might not be shown to anybody but burnt, tho' I found afterwards that you had sent it to Mr Stone.

Your Grace sees by my Lord Mansfield, the Bishop of Durham, and Mr Stone what you are to expect, in an opposition, from some of those who have the highest and strongest obligations to you. What then will others think? [Lord Powis, Lord Coventry and Lord Northumberland would probably not quit. Lord Ashburnham was unwilling and so was the Duke of Portland.]

You must forgive me, my dear Lord, if I express some surprise at your general observation, "that you see interest and corruption prevail so far that you despair of doing any good." This cannot possibly be new to your Grace, who have been conversant in courts and parties above these forty years. Have you not all along seen such motives to be the great hinges on which the generality of people's conduct has turned?

The greatest part of this reasoning is applied to the point of forming an opposition upon the ill usage of the Duke of Devonshire, and the indications arising from it as to the Court....If the Peace when produced should come out not to be admissible, that will make another cause. If this elevation of Mr Fox should revolt many persons, that may have a great effect. The point of a sole Scotch minister and favourite is fundamental, but I agree that this may require longer time to bring it to maturity, tho' I am convinced it cannot last long. [He is of opinion that resignations should be postponed.]...I have thought it my duty to write very plainly to your Grace....I shall expect the honour of your company on Wednesday. I have engaged Lord Royston, and hope Charles will find leisure....

[1] Above, pp. 354, 390.

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 305.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov.* 16, 1762.

...I send enclosed *a curiosity*[1], which was received whilst at dinner. It is not, nor does it profess to be, an answer to my letter which you read; but that is our friend's way when he is pressed, to pass by things which he knows not how to answer, whereof I have had many instances. However I like *the point*, to which the Duke of C[umberland] says he intends to bring M[r] P. and which I have underlined[2]....

Lord Royston to the Attorney-General

[H. 13, f. 37.] ST JAMES'S SQUARE, *Nov.* 23, 1762.

DEAR BROTHER,...

I find Lord Hardwicke is left out of the list of the Cabinet Council together with the Dukes of Newcastle and Devonshire; his inoffensive and temperate conduct has not preserved him from this mark of Royal displeasure, for such it is to one in his situation, and who has grown old in the service of this Royal Family....I suppose the Duke of Newcastle's late conduct etc. is laid to my Lord's door at Court whereas, God knows, his Grace has stood in no need of a spur....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 126; N. 260, f. 153.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Nov.* 26, 1762.

...I suppose your Lordship was as little pleased as I was with the appearance of the House of Lords yesterday[3]. Such shameful adulation to the minister and such a hum of applause I never expected to see in this House of Lords....[Some of the Tories had represented that they could not assist in the opposition to Lord Bute, if at the same time they were proscribed by the Whigs.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 260, f. 166.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov.* 27, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,...

It was impossible for me not to observe the complexion of the House of Lords on Thursday [25th]. I think I have seen as

[1] D. of N. to Lord H., November 15, 1762, H. 74, f. 114, in reply to the above.

[2] "The Duke is determined to bring him to a point, if anything is to be done now, or to wait for incidents as they arise."

[3] The opening of the new session and Address of Thanks to the King who, in his Speech, announced the signing of the Preliminary Articles of Peace. *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1230.

much adulation, but I did not perceive the hums of applause to be given to the compliments to the ministers but to the strong things said by my Lord Egmont relating to peace. But when one considers the motives which prevail in general, how can one wonder? And, besides the persuasive and interesting obligations they have laid upon old peers, they have made a considerable addition of new ones. And yet we ought not to deceive ourselves. We ought not to ascribe the whole to such causes; for I am persuaded, because I find it from all quarters, that the burden and tedium of the war and the desire of peace, are so strong in the generality of the Parliament and of the nation (abstracted from the interested or wild part of the City of London) that the very name of peace is agreeable to them, and they would have been content with terms rather lower than all we have yet been told of these Preliminaries.

The Ratifications certainly arrived this morning....I am told there was a full meeting of the Council[1], and it was held by summons but upon very short and, in some instances, absurd notice; for at a little after three o'clock, I was summoned *for half an hour past two....*

[He urges caution in attacking the conditions of peace when they should appear. The King, as well as the Sovereigns of France and Spain, had now ratified the Preliminaries. The less satisfactory points would not be sufficient to induce the general body of the Whigs to condemn the whole Peace, and personal considerations would also have weight.]

I make no doubt but Mr Pitt, if present, will declaim and flame in his way against this treaty in general, and so will probably my Lord Temple; but they will take in, and perhaps lay their chief stress upon, topics wherein we cannot agree with them; and I find many of our friends so tired of the leading of Mr Pitt and the violence of his friend Beckford, during the former administration, that they express great aversion to follow them....Neither he nor Lord Temple were present yesterday, and that was remarked.... I was told last night by a person pretty well informed that he has certainly lost the Tories. They reason thus—that they supported him; that he did nothing for them but fed them with hopes of what he would do for them in a new reign; that when that new reign came, he did nothing for them but all that was done was by my Lord Bute and by direct offer from the King, without any previous concert or even priority of Mr Pitt....To show weakness

[1] *I.e.* of the whole Privy Council.

rather than strength would, in this conjuncture, have the worst effect in the world[1].

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 135; N. 260, f. 196.] CLAREMONT, *Nov.* 29, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

I received yesterday by my servant your Lordship's two letters of the 27th and 28th which I have read over very carefully. I have long doubted, both from observation and reflection, whether it would be advisable for us to give any opposition to the Peace. The evident reasons against it are, the fear of acting inconsistently with ourselves, and that affects me more particularly than any of the rest, as I declared my opinion so strongly that peace was absolutely necessary, and as I am quoted for it by the King and all his ministers and speakers in Parliament. This does, and ought to, make me very cautious; for I abhor being inconsistent with myself from an alteration in my situation. But I can never admit that great and material alterations in circumstances ought not, with all impartial men, (if any such there are), to make great difference in opinion and in measures.

For example, if we had made such a peace in Mr Pitt's time, as we might then have made, we had saved the whole warlike expense of the year 1762. There was then no war with Spain, and no attempt upon Martinico. Since that we were, sillily at least, hurried into a war with Spain. Portugal, indeed, was attacked but almost cleared of the Spaniards before these Preliminaries were signed; Martinico has been taken, the greatest and strongest island that belongs to France; and, what regards France as well as Spain, the important conquest made of the Havannah; and what I think more material in argument than all the rest, the German dominions of His Majesty and those of his two allies, the Landgrave of Hesse and the Duke of Brunswick, absolutely cleared of all the French troops, so that there is nothing now to evacuate *there* as an equivalent to what we are to yield to France in the West Indies etc.

I own I still differ with your Lordship with regard to the evacuation of Wesel and Cleves. I know we had consented to a general evacuation. But...evacuation must, and ought to, be understood in favour of the real proprietor of the possessions so evacuated, which in the present case it is not. I still adhere to my old opinion that the evacuation of all Canada, possibly in the manner now done, was the first object, we ought to have in view,

[1] A following letter of November 28 also (f. 176). These letters, without Lord Hardwicke's permission, were sent to the Duke of Devonshire by the Duke of N. who adds: "My Lord Hardwicke would never forgive me, if he knew I had show'd these letters, but I trust your Grace with everything, depending upon your secrecy. And it is material that you should know what my Lord Hardwicke thinks; for he will act but awkwardly against his own or the opinion of his sons." (f. 202.)

as that carries security with it for the future; but I can never admit that being satisfied with that before the conquests of Martinico and the Havannah were made, both conquests in effect upon France as well as Spain, is a reason why we should give them and Guadeloupe up to France without any compensation from France for either.

And whilst we remained in Council, and even before the Havannah was taken, the Council was unanimously of opinion *first*, that we should retain Guadeloupe or have a cession of the whole [of] Louisiana or, at least, that we should retain the valuable island of S^t^ Lucia, from which Great Britain has never receded since the Treaty of Utrecht; and there is more reason to have it now than ever, as there is such a harbour there as would at any time enable us with safety to send a squadron of ships into those seas, superior to what France can bring against us, and thereby put us in a condition to defend our own islands and attack theirs with prospect of success....My opinion with regard to the Peace is plainly this; that if more able men had had the conduct of the negotiation, we might, considering the advantages flowing in upon us during the whole campaign, from every quarter of the world, have had a much better for ourselves, for our allies and for the support of our connection with the Continent.

My objection singly to attacking the Peace, is first, the fear that the interest of the public may be affected by it, as the peace is now made....I have also another most insurmountable objection, and that is I see so little disposition anywhere, but in some of our zealous friends in the House of Commons, to attack the *present power* in any shape....

[Lord Hardwicke must dine with him on Wednesday to meet the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Rockingham and Lord Kinnoull.]...

M^r^ Onslow[1]...acquaints me that there appeared the first day the greatest disposition in the House to show spirit; that Beckford was never so heard in his life; that our friends are most pressing for some point to show themselves upon and that they will not be easy without it, and that, if nothing else can be found out, they will attack the Peace which they think the most popular point they can go upon. Indeed, my Lord, this ought to be seriously considered by the Attorney-General and our friends of weight in the House of Commons. The Duke of Grafton, I hear, is most pressing for some point. Your Lordship will have seen the Duke of Devonshire. My nephew Onslow tells me that our friends in the House of Commons are desirous of collecting themselves together that they may know one another. For that purpose they wish to have a meeting. They are sure they shall be 180 at least. This deserves consideration, as I told M^r^ Onslow....M^r^ Onslow says that if nothing is done, and that soon, we shall not only lose all our friends, [but] that they will think themselves sacrificed;...if, after all they have done, it is to end in nothing, they must and will go elsewhere....

[1] See note, p. 407.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 260, f. 205.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov.* 29, 1762.

...I fear by the manner of writing that you are not pleased with me which, if it be so, will be a great mortification to me. But I hold it my duty to tell you my thoughts with sincerity and freedom; and what I have lately writ is perfectly agreeable to the whole tenor of my correspondence and discourse with your Grace all the last summer....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 158; N. 260, f. 289.] CLAREMONT, *Dec.* 14, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,...

Your Lordship will easily imagine that the contemptible figure we make (and myself more particularly) in both Houses, goes to my heart, and I don't see my way out of it. I must either abandon the few friends I have left or leave them to themselves to expose themselves and us.

It is but too true, what Mr Fox said at first to the Duke of Cumberland viz. My Lord Bute has got over all the Duke of Newcastle's friends. Never was man, who had had it in his power to serve, to make, to choose so great a part of the members of both Houses, so abandoned as I am at present. But that which hurts me the most (I say everything I think to your Lordship) is that I find it affects the dear Duchess of Newcastle extremely, and that those very few friends, who have taken their fate with me and resigned their employments, and those who by their behaviour in the House of Commons, expect every hour to be removed, are most extremely hurt, and rather blame me for exposing them and feeding them up with hopes of support where they found none....

I have not heard one single word from any creature since I have been here. The only thing that appears to me now to be done is to endeavour to calm our few friends, to wait for better times and some other opportunity. A better question we can never have, in my opinion, than our last, and I will maintain that everywhere....

Ever Yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 260, f. 312.] CLAREMONT, *Dec.* 19, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

I am under the greatest pain in writing to your Lordship at present, tho' my heart is so full that I cannot avoid it.

Your Lordship, I suppose, hears of the great violences which

my Lord Bute and his agent Mr Fox are carrying on against every man that is supposed to belong to, or to have any connection with, me and that I am singled out by them from the rest of the world, and particularly from those with whom I have acted, and in conjunction with whom I am still acting.

I never expected any regard would be paid to myself for having spent all my time and all my fortune in support of this royal family; *that* I suppose is my *crime*.—My heart is almost broke for the cruelties with which they are treating poor innocent men, in order to be revenged on me. They intend to turn out poor Sir Francis Poole's eldest son from being Commissioner of the Excise to make room for my Lord Gower's friend, Mr Vernon; and I hear also that his youngest son is to be removed from being a clerk in the Treasury, tho' he is undoubtedly one of the best clerks there. This goes to my heart; a poor old man in the eightieth year of his age, who has not an enemy in the world, to be actually turned a starving with two very valuable young sons and one daughter. This would melt the hearts of any ministers but these.

These cruelties and violences would not be carried on against my friends *only*, if my Lord Bute and Mr Fox did not see me abandoned by almost all my friends of consideration and consequence. They think they may do what they please with me; they see their majority in both Houses, and nobody in the House of Commons to support a joint measure taken by us all.

Allow me, my dear Lord, to say that it is very unkind usage; and to call to your mind all that has passed between me and my chief friends since I resigned my employment.

The measure agreed upon unanimously by us was to take all proper opportunities to deliver this country from the sole and arbitrary power of my Lord Bute. In that I thought we, viz. the Duke of Devonshire, the Marquess of Rockingham, your Lordship, your two sons and myself all concurred; and I can with truth affirm that no one person seemed more zealous in pursuit of that measure or more desirous to give me proofs of his personal friendship for me, during the course of many months, than Mr Attorney General, often repeating to me that he could not be hurt by the loss of his employment, which is certainly the case.

During the fluctuating negotiations of peace, many things arose which it was thought it might be nationally proper to oppose. It was resolved to give no opposition which could be prejudicial to the nation, but the point of opposing my Lord Bute's ministry upon any proper occasion was, I thought, a determined measure with us all.

The preliminaries were at last signed and published; great complaint was universally made of them, and the want of sufficient compensation for the great successes obtained this last year was thought sufficient to justify our not entering into an abject approbation of them all, without any knowledge or farther enquiry about them than what appeared from the articles themselves.

Your Lordship was so good as to support this joint measure with great strength and weight in the House of Lords, at the same time that my Lord Royston was voting against it in the House of Commons, and Mr Attorney General going out of the House without speaking or voting at all[1]. This gave such an alarm to all our friends that it was impossible to rally them afterwards. Many immediately took their part upon it. My friend, Mr Rawlinson Erle, and Mr Cocks of the Ordnance and, I believe, Sir Wyndham Knatchbull voted against us[2], contrary to what they had done the night before.

Had my Lord Royston and Mr Attorney General declared that they would not, or could not, come into any question relative to the Peace, however I myself, the Duke of Devonshire, my Lord Rockingham, and the few friends which I have left, might have been sorry for it, no one of us would have been for going on with that measure afterwards.

I will go still further; had they declared that they would not enter into an opposition to my Lord Bute and Mr Fox, I dare say no one of us would have exposed ourselves so much as to have been for one.

My Lord Mansfield and his friends (who ought to have been mine) gone off at first, many of my friends of less consideration on account of their circumstances or other pretences deserting me, and afterwards, what I never could think, your Lordship's family and every one under their influence in the House of Commons, leaving me at last. This exposes me to contempt and my friends to starve, and I am in my conscience convinced, if my Lord Bute had not seen me so deserted, he would not have dared to have acted with this violence and cruelty towards those who belonged to me....

Think, my dear Lord, what figure that man now makes, unsupported, unassisted, and exposed to the contempt of his enemies and the reproach of his unhappy friends; one who has bore some character in the world for near half a century, at least without any blemish put upon it, who had had a considerable share in carrying on the public business and in the disposition of all employments, and above all who has had the advantage and assistance of the most intimate friendship and connection with your Lordship for above forty years, who has never taken one step but by your advice and has never during the whole time omitted in any one single instance to make your Lordship's cause and that of all your Lordship's family, his own.

If any *effort* can be made or any remedy can be suggested, to ease me of the burden which now oppresses me, I am sure your Lordship will suggest it.

Far am I from imputing any part of my misfortunes to yourself, except a little too much caution in what relates to your family and your friends. I hope these misfortunes, which are more than

[1] He followed Pitt's example, above, p. 375.

[2] The two last were relations of Lady Hardwicke.

I can well bear, will not produce any coolness between your Lordship and myself, or deprive me of that friendship and advice which I have now enjoyed for so many years.

I saw from the beginning that my friends in the House of Commons were condemned; that I did not, and do not, complain of, tho' the resentment is confined to my friends *only*. But their carrying their resentment so far as to remove all my friends and relations from offices, not in the House of Commons, and where the objects of their resentment could not offend, and particularly in such a cruel instance as that of poor old Sir Francis Poole's sons, of as ancient a family as any in this kingdom, men valuable and amiable in themselves, turned at once out to starve, is I say such a stretch of power as is hardly constitutional, and justifies me in firmly believing that no man is, or can be, a true friend of mine who shall remain in office, shall aid, support and abet ministers capable of using me and my friends in this outrageous manner.

To conclude, I must beg your Lordship to let me know what your family finally intend to do. I felt as I ought for the cruel treatment of the Duke of Devonshire; I resented it as became me; I hope others will feel for me and resent it accordingly.

Since writing what is above, my Lord Villiers and my cousin Pelham came to me and have acquainted me with many more cruelties that are to be inflicted upon my friends and relations. Mr Fox declares he will not spare one single man. Tomorrow is the day of execution. My cousin Harry Pelham is to be turned out of the customs. Poor Jack Shelley to have his custom house place (which my brother gave him in trust) taken from him; poor Jack Butler to lose his employment held in the same manner, and his trustee, who held it for him, to be removed from another employment, which he held in his own right and, in short, Mr Fox is inquiring after every employment where I had placed any one of my friends. I am to be removed from my three lieutenancies.... There is to be quite a new admiralty...and my Lord Villiers and Tom Pelham turned out. My nephew Onslow is turned out.... Poor Wilkinson, the only one in the ordnance, turned out....The Duke of Devonshire, the Duke of Grafton and the Marquess of Rockingham are also to be removed from their respective lieutenancies.—If this list of insolences, insults, and affronts are not sufficient to engage my friends to declare themselves so, I must say it is but a slender friendship they have for me.

I dine with my nephew Onslow on Tuesday next....I intend to wait upon your Lordship in the evening. Pray receive me kindly and pity me, for I ought to be an object of your Lordship's pity and compassion.

I am with great truth, my dear Lord etc.

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

...If there is anything in this letter that your Lordship may think proper to answer, I beg it may be in return to this letter; for

it would add greatly to my present uneasiness to be talking to your Lordship upon such very disagreeable subjects.

If we are all removed from our lieutenancies and this persecution of all my friends in the under offices is pursued, against persons to whose charge no ill-conduct can be laid, might it not be made a proper cause of complaint in the House of Commons? Especially when the behaviour of the members in the House of Commons who shall be removed is notoriously the occasion of the one and of the other. Is not such an extent or ill use of power, as *cognizable* and as much to be blamed, as the exerting a power which does not belong to the Crown or those acting under it?

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[H. 74, f. 160; N. 260, f. 323.]

GROSVENOR SQUARE, Monday, *Dec. 20th*, 1762, at night.

MY DEAR LORD,

The letter which I had the honour to receive from your Grace this day at noon, could not possibly give you so much pain in writing as it did me in reading it. Indeed, I never expected, nor could possibly have figured to myself a time, wherein I should receive such a letter from your Grace. I do not mean to answer it *just now*, tho' I think I could give a just answer to every word that concerns myself and my family, notwithstanding one unhappy circumstance which has given me more uneasiness than it can do you[1]. But I perceive your mind to be too much agitated at present, and my sincere affection for your Grace makes me feel too much and too strongly for your present situation, to admit of it. Thus much I cannot help saying that after forty years unvaried attachment and faithful services, whereby I have humbly endeavoured to repay those many obligations which I have received, several of which services you have acknowledged as substantial by letters under your own hand, which I have by me, I have not deserved those stinging reproaches which are partly expressed and partly insinuated in your letter.

Nobody can be more provoked at, nor more detest and abhor, those violences which have been committed against your Grace's friends, nor think many of them more cruel than I do: and I look upon one additional cause of their having been mostly so distinguishedly pointed against you, to have been in order to raise those jealousies, which I am sorry to find have too much taken place in your mind. One consolation (tho' indeed I can hardly

[1] Lord Royston's vote.

call it so in the present disagreeable circumstances) is that this has not proceeded from any advice of mine. For tho' your Grace is pleased to say "that you have never taken one step but by my advice," I must beg leave to refer to the whole tenor of my correspondence this summer to prove that I have always given my opinion against beginning an opposition by attacking the peace, in case it should come out to be such as it now appears to be, and against forming that opposition under the present avowed leader[1] (tho' a very respectable one) under whom, I fear, it is the less likely to succeed. As to the opposing of my Lord Bute as sole Scotch favourite and minister, I have always allowed it in general, but have repeatedly maintained, both in letters and in conversation, that that point was not yet come to maturity; and that more overt acts and events ought to be waited for, and perhaps those may now not be far off.

I have kept no copies of my letters except the last of November the 15th; and as I am very sensible that nothing which I write is much worth attending to, it is not to be expected that your Grace should take the trouble of looking back for them; but if they were looked into, I think the tenor of them would appear as I have here represented it, with this addition, that I have more than once foretold and pointed out the labour, inquietude and uneasiness, both in respect of ourselves and our friends, which the situation we are now got into, would occasion to us both, at a time of life not fit to go thro' it.

But I forbear—; nor should I have writ so much at present, had not your Grace in your postscript forbid me to talk to you *on such disagreeable subjects*. If your Grace continues in your kind intention of doing me the honour of a visit tomorrow evening, I shall strictly observe this injunction on my part, for nobody can possibly feel for you with more friendship and affection than,

my dearest Lord,

ever yours,

HARDWICKE*.

[1] The Duke of Cumberland.

* The letter which occasioned this is not amongst my Father's papers. It was never shown to us and certainly burnt. It is my firm opinion that the vexation my Father went through in the two last years shortened his life. H.

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 260, f. 335] most secret. CLAREMONT, *Dec.* 23, 1762.

MY DEAR LORD,

As I take the liberty to trouble your Grace with everything that relates to myself or to our general situation, I enclose to you a copy of a letter, which upon due consideration I wrote some days ago to my Lord Hardwicke, and of his Lordship's answer; and tho' I am sorry to give him one moment's uneasiness, yet as I think every word of the letter true, I am not sorry that I have wrote it. I had a long friendly conversation with his Lordship that evening with which I am very well satisfied, and by which I find that my letter has done no material hurt.

Your Grace has seen most of the letters which have passed between my Lord Hardwicke and me this summer, and I appeal to you whether the general substance of them as well as what has passed at our meetings, do not justify what I have said, in my last letter, with regard to the plan to be followed by us in what they call our opposition....

[He contrasts the conduct of Fox with his own with regard to the latter and his friends when he (the Duke) was in power, none of whom had he ever injured. He enumerates further removals. Lord Gower had said "that they would turn out every custom house officer in Sussex down to offices of £50 per annum only." He had attended the Duke of Cumberland's Levée, who adhered to his opinion that they should keep quiet till some point arose and some leader and some plan; but that possibly the removal of so many lords-lieutenant, in whose family the office had been ever since the advent of the present royal family to the throne, might be a proper matter of parliamentary consideration. His followers were eager for active measures and were about to organise a club.]

I now come to give your Grace a full account of the long conference which I had on Tuesday night with my Lord Hardwicke, after I had received his letter in the morning.

I found my Lord Hardwicke extremely kind and affectionate to me. I made some excuses for my letter which was occasioned from the anxiety I must be in. I found him *lame* in the justification of either of his sons; and indeed, that I was not surprised at. I wanted to discover what they would do; and in regard to his two sons personally, I think it was reduced to this, little material in respect to my Lord Royston but very material with regard to the Attorney General. He said the Attorney was to be married on Thursday next[1], after that he would have a full conversation with him and know his intentions, and the plan which he would lay down for himself; and from what my Lord Hardwicke let drop, I should not be surprised (but this is pure conjecture) if Mr Attorney

[1] Charles Yorke married as his second wife, on December 30, Agneta, daughter and coheir of Henry Johnstone of Great Berkhampstead.

General should now determine to quit both his office of Attorney General and his profession, and be an independent member of Parliament of great consideration. What that may produce, I know not. He would make a good leader or at least one of the leaders, if he would take that part....

As to business, my Lord Hardwicke expressed himself very strongly against this administration, my Lord Bute and Mr Fox; that these acts of violence and the present principles, by which my Lord Bute governed himself, give greater apprehensions for the preservation of the Constitution (or words to that purpose) than he had ever remembered; that the plan was that which the late Prince of Wales sent by my Lord Talbot to the Tories, and that they governed themselves entirely by that; that he feared that Whiggism would not exist in this Kingdom long[1].

But notwithstanding these apprehensions which have made a most deep impression upon him, he doubted what could be done. He feared this ministry would go on and these violences continue. He seemed to enter into the Duke [of Cumberland]'s notion that the change of so many lieutenancies at once, and by that overturning the very establishments of those counties, fixed now for near fifty years, the introducing new Governors, new principles, new measures, with the addition of the present violent proceedings, might furnish a proper occasion for some parliamentary consideration. He promised he would turn it seriously in his thoughts and see what could be done. He desired me to send to the late Speaker, Mr Onslow (which I have done) to turn it also in his thoughts, and see whether something might not be struck out upon it. My Lord Hardwicke instanced the Address of the House of Commons in Charles the 2nd's time, to restore the Duke of Monmouth to all his employments. Anything of that kind I objected strongly to; they then would say the question was whether the Duke of Newcastle and the Duke of Devonshire should ride in the State Coach, or the King.

Upon the whole, I found my Lord Hardwicke very serious and disposed to see whether any thing can be done or not. What his sons may wish to do, or what influence they may have upon him, I cannot say....

There is one point which is barely touched by my Lord Hardwicke, but I know is made a handle by others, a most unjust supposition, that the Duke of Cumberland pushes on the opposition, the contrary of which your Grace, as well as myself, knows to be true. My Lord Hardwicke himself cannot be more cautious about opposition and anything that may carry either disrespect to the King or hurt his Majesty's proper authority or prerogative than the Duke, and it is very hard to charge him with the contrary. I hope my Lord Hardwicke has dropped nothing of this kind. The Duke told me he had heard, he had, tho' H.R. Highness said he was not angry with it, but to be sure he cannot be pleased....

[1] Above, vol. i. p. 336, vol. ii. p. 42.

I absolutely denied to the Duke that my Lord Hardwicke had ever had such a thought.

[In conclusion, if his friends said and thought that no opposition was now practicable, he should acquiesce and feel easy, having done his duty.]

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 165; N. 260, f. 362.] CLAREMONT, *Dec. 25th*, 1762.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I send your Lordship a most cruel letter which I have received this morning from my *good friend* and near relative the Earl of Halifax....

I am very sorry that the King has ministers about him, capable and able to induce His Majesty to take two lieutenancies from an old faithful servant and subject of his royal family, which he has enjoyed from the hour this royal family came to the crown, now near fifty years....

I have nothing to say; I am in the hands of my friends....

I am with the greatest respect and most unalterable affection,

ever most sincerely yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. Since writing this letter, my nephew, Tommy Townshend Jun^{r}, is come in[1]. He has had a long conference with his neighbour M^{r} Pitt. M^{r} Pitt still continues to refuse any junction with me, but will act in the House of Commons with us upon all great occasions, and that he should attend upon such points. He seems extremely hurt with the Tories and talks of all the world's giving in to my Lord Bute with great concern, and declaims loudly against the violences, and particularly the cruel treatment of the Duke of Devonshire. I don't know whether this disposition in M^{r} Pitt may not confine our friends, not to be attempting anything impracticable or unadvisable. M^{r} Pitt talked with the greatest respect of my friends, as the true friends to the Revolution and those with whom every friend of the government would like to act. He once dropped whether those Tories, who would act upon Revolution principles, might not be received. Lord Rockingham is pleased with Pitt's conversation[2].

[1] Thomas Townshend (1733–1800), grandson of the second Viscount Townshend, the statesman; M.P. for Whitchurch; one of those dismissed from office this year; afterwards an active member of the opposition and Secretary for War under Lord Rockingham in 1782; created Baron Sydney 1783.

[2] Charles Watson-Wentworth (1730–1782), second Marquess of Rockingham, a lord of the Bedchamber till 1762 when he resigned and was dismissed from his lord-lieutenancies; a close friend of Lord Hardwicke's family, a statesman of high character and a staunch Whig; he succeeded the Duke of Newcastle as leader of the chief and most enlightened section of the party; First Lord of the Treasury 1765 and again in 1782.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 260, f. 366.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Dec.* 25, 1762.

[Lord Bute's and Fox's friends laid the blame for the late acts of violence on each other. The Duke of Grafton had also been dismissed from his lord-lieutenancy, but not the Duke of Devonshire, in whose case, as having already received a mark of the King's displeasure, it was pretended to make a distinction.

Lord Hardwicke expresses his indignation at the violent and unworthy measures of the ministers and at the King's ingratitude. These acts, however, would at last turn upon their authors.]...One piece of advice I will venture to throw out, because I think it clear, which is that, with submission, you should not in your conversations upon this subject talk too much in a plaintive style, but in a style of disregard and defiance as to the ministers, and hold up your head the higher. The latter will raise the spirits of your friends, whereas the former appearance will lower them.

I cannot say that I am much edified with Mr Pitt's discourse with Tommy Townshend jun^r^. His continuing to refuse any junction with your Grace will have a very bad effect. It is plain that if he adheres to what he says, that he does not mean to attend the House much, and an attendance now and then upon great occasions only, will not answer the purposes of an opposition. ...As to receiving such of the Tories as will act upon Revolution principles, your Grace knows it has been agreed between us already. But as to principles, I am really at a loss where to find them.

Notwithstanding all this, I heartily wish and hope that your Grace and the Duchess of Newcastle may in reality enjoy all that happiness which is expressed in the usual compliments of this season. Happiness does not consist in these outward ornaments and trappings of life, but the truest and surest foundation of felicity is to despise them. I have been convinced of it ever since the year 1756, having never enjoyed more real satisfaction.

I am, my dearest Lord, if possible more than ever,

unalterably yours,

HARDWICKE.

[On Dec. 26, 1762 (N. 260, f. 370), the Duke of Devonshire gives the same advice as Lord Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle, to take no action at present but to wait upon events and show

a bold front. He continues:] Hurt as your Grace is with reason, I was not surprised at your letter to Lord Hardwicke, tho' I cannot help wishing that it had not been wrote. You know him well and must be aware, however strong his friendship is for your Grace, and I am persuaded ever will remain, yet he cannot help feeling and in some measure resenting what you have said; his Lordship's expression of *stinging reproaches* I do not like, and sincerely wish no disagreeable consequences may arise from it....

Earl of Kinnoull[1] *to the Duke of Newcastle*

[N. 260, f. 376.] BATH, *Dec.* 26, 1762.

...When your Grace went out of business, I did most devoutly wish, that you would have pursued a plan of real retirement, which you might have done with the greatest dignity, and preserving the highest consideration in this country;...and I foresaw that opposition would lead you into a scene of endless disquiet and vexation, which, from the sensibility and goodness of your heart, you would feel more than any other man.

...Your Grace will permit me in this place to touch a very tender subject which has given you, not without cause, the greatest anxiety. I am not privy to what passed between your Grace and Lord Hardwicke in the course of the summer. All I know is what I have heard since I came to town from his Lordship's own mouth. And I must bear my testimony that he has in every conversation, where I have been present, uniformly declared against a formed opposition and that he did give his advice in the strongest manner against the measure of opposing the approbation of the peace, tho' when he was overruled by your Grace and the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Rockingham, he acquiesced, and agreed to take his part, which he did. At the same time I must with equal candour say that your Grace ought to have been previously acquainted with the real intentions of his two eldest sons, and of the manner in which the family and their connections were to act in that material business, that you might have formed your judgment and taken your measures accordingly. Indeed, I am truly concerned that your Grace wrote that letter to him of which the copy is inclosed in your packet. His answer plainly shows how much he is hurt; and tho' his friendly conversation inclines your Grace to think that it has done no material mischief, I cannot but be apprehensive that the impression is deep and will be lasting. By him, and by him alone, his family can be brought back to those connections with which I am persuaded he himself wishes them to act a steady and open part, and your Grace was yourself persuaded that he not only disapproved of Lord Royston's vote but was heartily concerned for

[1] Thomas Hay, eighth Earl of Kinnoull (1710–1787), known formerly as Lord Dupplin; M.P. for Cambridge, and an intimate friend of the D. of N. and Lord H.'s family; of considerable political ability; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in the D. of N.'s last administration; he now retired entirely from public life.

it. I look upon it as a great misfortune that in the heat of that anxiety, which the persecution of your friends naturally raised in your breast, you sat down to write to Lord Hardwicke upon a subject so delicate to him and which must naturally, from what you felt, produce warm expressions what you see he interprets to be unkind suggestions. Indeed, my dear Lord Duke, you must forgive me if I mention upon this occasion, that when the conduct of any of your friends is disagreeable to you, you are very apt in the first moments of sudden resentment to take up your pen and to enter into expostulations of reproach with acrimony and severity which, in your cooler thoughts, you would moderate at least; and I am convinced that such letters have often alienated from you the friendship of some men whom you would not otherwise have lost, and rendered the attachment of others less warm and affectionate.

However, I cannot yet persuade myself that Lord Hardwicke's family will separate themselves from your Grace and take an active part with this administration, as it is now composed. After what is passed, it is difficult to say whether they themselves will take an active part in the opposition and how far they will think fit to exert the full force of their influence with their connections; yet I think Mr Attorney General is too considerable in himself to be either neuter or indifferent, and if he acts himself, he should for his own sake bring with him all the strength he can. I hope, if he quits his employment, he will not quit his profession; for he will be much more considerable as the first man in Westminster Hall which he will be, whether in or out of the King's service, than as a private gentleman. And besides, if he retires from business, the ministers will then be at full liberty to make such a disposition, as shall be most agreeable to them, of the first offices of the law, without incurring the odium of passing him by who is, in the opinion of all the world, greatly superior to any other man at the Bar....It [is] still left to a future deliberation to be had between Lord Hardwicke and Mr Attorney General to determine with precision what his intentions may be. It is therefore as yet doubtful what Lord Royston, Mr Attorney, their family and connections will do. And it is very material that it should be known with certainty before any plan can be formed....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 169; N. 260, f. 399.] CLAREMONT, *Dec.* 27, 1762.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I was so happy yesterday with your most affectionate, most wise and most spirited letter[1], that I could hardly defer returning your Lordship my most sincere thanks for it till this morning. I sent it immediately to the Duchess of Newcastle, who is greatly relieved by it, as she is with everything that comes

[1] December 25.

from your Lordship. Your letter contained everything I could wish; the most affectionate concern and resentment for the undeserved indignities put upon me, the most proper advice to me for my present conduct, which I shall most undoubtedly follow, and an anxiety for what (if any thing) it may be right to do upon it....Give me leave now, my dearest Lord, to return you once more my most sincere thanks for your most obliging and amiable letter, and particularly for the very kind conclusion of it. I agree entirely that happiness does not consist in the outward ornaments and trappings of life but in the satisfaction of having done right; and if in what I have done or shall do, I have the approbation of your Lordship and of those friends whose judgment and friendship I can depend upon, I despise all that the arbitrary Scotch minister or his intriguing agent can do. You can't imagine how easy your letter makes me[1]. The spirit of it and the solidity of the advice charms the Duchess of Newcastle....I am more than I can express, and (if possible) more than ever,

Most unalterably yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

P.S. The peevish thing of removing me from Sherwood Forest[2] will hurt my Lord Lincoln; to me it is nothing for I never go there. I am sorry to have it out of the family where it has been time out of mind....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 261, f. 1.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *New Year's Day*, 1763.

...That M[r] Fox should be for turning out all my family I readily believe, nor have I any reason to think that my Lord Bute would disagree with him about it[3]. On that point I am extremely easy, for let it come when it will, they will find themselves in good company. I can also easily conceive that M[r] Fox would be for bringing in the Duke of Cumberland's and the Duke of Devonshire's friends; for the town has been for some days very full of hints and reports of his endeavouring to raccommode there. I dare say both those great persons despise the attempt; but it has been observed that that gentleman is constantly at H.R. Highness's Levée, and always stays to the very last in the vain hopes, as is supposed, of being sent for in.

[He is not of opinion that the acts of violence are in themselves technically a breach of the constitution, and they can be parallelled

[1] He writes to Lord Rockingham (N. 260, f. 404), "I have received from my great friend, my Lord Hardwicke, the most affectionate, the most spirited and the *greatest* letter that ever was wrote from one friend to another."

[2] The Rangership. [3] Above, p. 380.

in recent times, though not to an equal extent. But it might be urged that ministers, who are capable of so advising the King and so behaving under the guise of his authority, might justly be suspected of most dangerous invasions of the constitution, should such be necessary for their purposes.]...Pray make Jones get your Grace blacker ink for, upon my word, I can hardly decipher these last letters.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 261, f. 159.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Jan.* 22, 1763.

...He [Lord Mansfield] threw out some dark suspicions about *French faith*, upon which I asked him about the affair of the Newfoundland fishery....They should have supported our fishermen in their right without making any noise, which they might have done only by sending out the usual annual squadron to Newfoundland a little the earlier, with secret orders relative to the subject of the memorial [of the West Indian traders in that fishery]. As your Grace, when you writ your letter, did not seem to have been fully informed of this subject, I will state shortly how I understand it. For some time before this war broke out, the French claimed an exclusive sole right of fishing and curing their fish within the district allowed by the Treaty of Utrecht, viz: from Cape Bonavista on the East side to Point Rich on the Western side, and, it is said, they often turned off our fishermen from thence by force. Of this I never heard any complaint here, tho' there is no pretence for such a claim by that Treaty which allows only a liberty of fishing in common, and so my Lord Mansfield declared his opinion in the strongest manner. This west-country memorial asserts that by the change of the course of the fish, the shoals of late years coming in mostly that way (a change which frequently happens from natural causes), this part of the fishery is become much the most valuable. Therefore the memorialists are afraid, and say they have intelligence that the French design to be beforehand with us in getting possession of those banks, coves and places for erecting stages etc:, and desire the support of the Government here in being beforehand with the French and in getting possession of the most advantageous places, not so as absolutely to keep out the French but not to be excluded by them. This depends entirely on the 13th article of the Treaty of Utrecht, for the Preliminaries have made no variation in it; nor was one word said about it either in 1761 or 1762, whilst we continued of the Council. If Mr Pitt, who insisted

so strenuously against reviving that article of the Treaty of Utrecht, had caught hold of this objection of the abuse which the French had been guilty of, it had been more material than any other objection relied upon by him against it. But it is plain he had never heard of it then; nor can I learn that he mentioned it in his long oration in the House of Commons on the 9th of December....

[On January 24, 1763 (H. 74, f. 204), the Duke of Newcastle sends Lord Hardwicke a long list of proscriptions of his friends and appeals for support.]

Duke of Newcastle to Hugh Valence Jones

[N. 261, f. 208.] *Jan.* 25, 1763.

...I have an account from a good hand that Mr Fox is outrageous, or very angry, that the Yorkes are not yet attacked; and treats the ill usage towards me and my friends as ridiculous, if not carried farther; and indeed, it is much talked of that this advice will be followed soon. The Chancellor's ill-humour checks their proceedings in the law....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 268, f. 51.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov.* [*i.e. Jan.*] 25, 1763.

...Your Grace with great justice gives this list the epithets of *most cruel and inhumane.* It is so in the highest degree. It may satisfy a low revenge for the present and enable them to oblige some particular persons, but it will provoke and irritate so many more that I cannot think it will tend to promote their interest.... After such a conduct no managements ought to be kept with them, except such as may prevent our attempting anything that may tend to strengthen them or to hurt the Public. Your Grace's long and meritorious services to the King's family and to your country will, in a little time, shine forth the brighter for this fiery trial; and though your good nature will make you compassionate the particular objects of this severity, I think you ought, and I hope you will, despise the attack, so far as it is aimed to wound you. You call it by a wrong name when you call it *a mark of contempt.* It is in truth the direct contrary; for it proceeds from fear, so far as it is meant to disarm you of any remains of power and influence....I believe no parallel case is to be found....The freedom and independency of Parliament is so much concerned in this that, if it were *res integra*, it might create attention. This goes to a constitutional point; but I fear these private cases, tho' cruel and numerous, would find no great weight there....

Your Grace says very truly that they have not spared me in the instance of Mr Papillon[1]....I, from the first notice of it...determined to make no kind of application, nor to give any hint tending to it, either directly or indirectly; nor have I done it, because I would not be supposed to contract any new obligation. I sent Mr Papillon word so from the first, and to do him justice, he has behaved in a very handsome manly manner upon the occasion....I hear Mr Fox talks very familiarly of the *Yorkes* and I can easily believe it. Let it come when it will. *Impavidum ferient ruinae*....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[H. 261, f. 293.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Feb.* 2, 1763.

...Your Grace says that you are of opinion, "that nothing effectual can be done, unless Mr Pitt will take an active part in it, and to a degree set himself at the head of it." In this opinion we have all professed to agree, but I begin now to have less hopes of it than ever. I met my Lord Temple yesterday at Cumberland House and enquired of him concerning Mr Pitt. His Lordship said he was yesterday (Tuesday) morning in town for two hours and went back again. Upon my replying—"But I suppose he will come to settle in town soon,"—Lord Temple said he did not know; that he was fond of being at Hayes, but he believed he would come to town when any material business was to come on in the House of Commons. This way of talking...and more especially his not going to the Duke of Cumberland again after the overture made by H.R.H., tho' he is said to have been as well for some time past as ever he was in his life, I say these circumstances combined together do, in my opinion, shew a backwardness which must have its *motive*. Whether that motive be an aversion to join with us, a desire to keep his connection with the Tories or some management for the Court, or partly all three, I am not wise enough to determine. But sure I am this conduct will not serve to carry on an opposition....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 261, f. 317.] CLAREMONT, *Feb.* 5, 1763.

...I am sorry to acquaint you that I have every day more reason to fear that Lord Hardwicke's sons are all against me. Mr Papillon is not to be out....This can't be for nothing, and it is very indifferent to me whether my Lord Royston applied for him or whether my Lord Bute, satisfied with their conduct, saved him without it....

[1] See vol. i. p. 51, vol. ii. p. 563. But see below, p. 454.

Duke of Devonshire to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 261, f. 330.] *Feb.* 6, 1763.

Your Grace is certainly right in your observation that his [Pitt's] pension runs in his mind and which accounts for all his delicacies.... I put the question to him [Lord Temple] that Mr Pitt's backwardness the first day of the session was owing to his apprehensions of doing the D. of Newcastle's business. His Lordship in a manner acknowledged it by saying: "To be sure Mr Pitt would not choose to be any man's *factor*."

...I shall be very sorry if the family of the Yorkes should take a wrong turn, and tho' the appearances are such as create suspicion, yet it is very material not to seem to suspect them and therefore, for God's sake, be very cautious in what you write or say; for if you blame and reproach them with their conduct, you will give them a pretence to fly out, which at this time should most carefully be avoided; perhaps, when they find out that Mr Pitt etc: are coming to a right understanding with us, they may act with more spirit and be more disposed to take a proper part....

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 316.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *March 8th*, 1763.

DEAR ROYSTON,...

Lord Ravensworth kept us yesterday till past five o'clock. I send you inclosed a copy of his questions, which (altho' the House was very full) had both gone, if I had not stood up to object to them just as the first was putting[1]. The part was a little delicate, but I debated against it merely on parliamentary principles, and the experience of an old parliamentary man. Afterwards nobody was for my Lord's questions, and many Lords (*inter quos the great Lord B*[*ute*]) thanked me for having saved them trouble. When Lord Ravensworth divided the House, nobody rose to go out but himself, and my Lord Mansfield, being on the Woolsack, named him a Teller to count his *own knit*.

I am to dine today at Devonshire House at what, I suppose, will be called a political dinner—Mr Pitt, the Duke of Newcastle, Marquess of Rockingham and Lord Temple;—who else I know not. But I suppose we shall not be suspected of plotting, because I hear Pitt is just now in high odour at Court....

Yours affectionately,

H.

[1] Sir Thomas Henry Liddell, first Lord Ravensworth. For the production of the war accounts, see p. 381.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 222; N. 262, f. 216.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *March* 12, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,

I have wanted extremely to have had an opportunity of seeing your Lordship...to have acquainted your Lordship with a material conversation I had had with my Lord Temple on Wednesday.

His Lordship was in high spirits and said that what he had been about unsuccessfully for six months viz: the bringing Mr Pitt and us together, is now come about, as it were, of itself; that nothing could be better, that his wishes and desires were fully answered. He then entered into particulars and wished to know what part Lord Granby and the Attorney General would take.... He talked with the utmost regard of the Attorney General, and of Mr Pitt's regard for him also. I told my Lord Temple that I would acquaint the Attorney General with what he had said, which I did that night. Mr Attorney General said he would talk to your Lordship about it as I did intend to do....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 228.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *March* 29, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,

We were all extremely concerned that we could not have the honour of your Lordship's company. Everybody was full of approbation and indeed gratitude for the great and successful part you took yesterday[1], and nobody more than my Lord Temple and his friend Mr Pitt. Mr Pitt was in the highest spirits and foresaw every good consequence from what passed yesterday in the House of Lords. Mr Pitt says we have two such points, the corruption, and immensity of the profit of the bargain[2], and the carrying the most odious part of the excise, the power of entering into private houses, particularly into part of the kingdom only, that if we make good use of them, must have an universal good effect. He is for *protesting*[3], but I take that to be over. All the Lords are sending far and near to our friends to be at the House tomorrow, and I hope your Lordship will be there. The House is ordered to be summoned. There has a very extraordinary event happened. Sir Robert Ladbroke told the Duke of Devonshire that my Lord Bute had sent for Sir James Hodges to acquaint the Common Council that, if they would drop their address to the King, he would engage that the bill should be repealed next Session. This has created an universal flame in both Houses, both friends and foes, who call it a contempt to both Houses of Parliament and

[1] In speaking against the Cider Bill, above, p. 382. [2] Above, pp. 378–9.
[3] In the Lords.

preferring the Common Council to them. My Lord, I hear, denies having sent any such *message* by Sir James Hodges, but owns his having sent to Sir James Hodges to talk to him. The ministers met at the House of Lords and seemed in great confusion. For this reason, as well as on the question of the Bill, our friends hope everybody will be at the House.

Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 263, f. 54.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *April* 8, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,

Had I received any material intelligence relating to the extraordinary event which has happened this day, before yesterday, I should certainly have troubled your Grace with the best account of it I could have given. But even what I heard yesterday was so vague and uncertain that I knew not what stress to lay upon it, especially as to the supposed suddenness of the execution.—I am just come from the King's Levée, where I had determined to go before anything was said of this change, otherwise I should have chose another day. His Majesty said a very few words civilly as usual, and looked in much better humour than I expected. Lord Bute actually resigned this forenoon but nobody kissed hands, nor could I find that anything else is actually carried into execution. When I came out from the Levée, I met with both the Secretaries of State together who immediately entered into conversation, of which Lord Halifax had the greatest share. They both assured me that they had not the least hint of any such intention till Good Friday morning, when Lord Bute sent for them and then first acquainted them with his resolution, in which he declared himself fixed, and that he would take no other place nor remain at all about the Court to have the imputation of being a minister behind the curtain; that his health was very bad, disorders in his bowels and upon his nerves, chiefly owing to want of exercise which the two Secretaries avowed they believed to be true; that he would go immediately to Harrogate and afterwards to Lady Bute's house at Wortley and there stay (no very desirable residence I fancy); that it was his firm intention to give them no trouble in the way of business, unless now and then to ask a small favour perhaps for a friend; that this he should take kindly if they complied with, nor should he take it ill if they did not, having experienced the different

and troublesome solicitations in such cases. They said Mr Grenville was to be Chancellor of the Exchequer and at the head of the Treasury....This was all I heard from the two Secretaries, and I thought they talked in the style of the *ministers.*

...Fox told Mr West that he had strictly performed his bargain, that he should go up to the House of Lords next week, and then immediately go abroad for his health....Your Grace will easily imagine that the King's looks are much observed upon. Mr West told me that it was observed by some ladies yesterday at the Queen's Drawing-Room that his Majesty never appeared more easy nor in better humour—*that he looked like a person just emancipated.* This falls in with what I observed in his appearance today.

If he is so much pleased, it must be by reason of what he has parted with; for if he takes much satisfaction in what he is come to, he differs from much the greater part of his subjects. Everybody stands amazed at the arrangement and thinks it cannot last a month, and that there is no sense in it, unless as a passage to something else. It puts me in mind of Mr Fox's administration formed in 1757, which also was the work of an Easter holidays, but could never be launched, and ended in bringing back your Grace and Mr Pitt....It is said that there are two persons to whom the King has given an absolute exclusion viz: Lord Temple and Mr Pitt; that with one of them, at least, the King is irreconcileable and the Princess with the other, but as to other persons it is no[t] quite so, but temperaments may be found[1]. Under the last head they mean to include your Grace, but neither of them hinted one word of this nature to me....Great caution ought to be used in what shall be said or done upon that head in every view, on the one hand not to make a division amongst yourselves and on the other not to irritate the King's mind too much. But if his Majesty is really so possessed, what a wicked part has Lord Bute acted! To pretend to quit, not only his office but the Court entirely, under a pretence of making the King easy in his affairs, and at the same time to instil such invincible prejudices into him as may make his coming to a settlement impracticable! For how the business of the House of Commons can be carried on without Mr Pitt, I know not....I cannot help pitying the King, who is the victim in all this. I never saw such a scene, except in June 1757, and I wish his Majesty may get out of it as well as his Grandfather did then....

[1] Below, p. 496.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE OPPOSITION

THE new Cabinet was pledged to carry on the same political system as the last, and Lord Bute's retirement had not taken place till the chief objects of his administration had been secured. His fall constituted, nevertheless, a triumph for public opinion and could not fail to encourage greatly the foes of the government. But just at the moment which seemed most propitious, and when the Whig leaders had at length begun to unite and to agree upon concerted action[1], differences on serious questions of principle arose between them, which created new divisions and prevented once more the formation of any organized opposition.

On April 23, 1763, the famous No. 45 of the *North Briton* was published by John Wilkes, which contained a fierce attack upon the King's Speech, pronounced at the prorogation of Parliament, on April 19, who, it was declared, had given "the sanction of his sacred name to the most odious measures, and to the most unjustifiable public declarations, from a throne ever renowned for truth, honour and unsullied virtue[2]." The offence which, in Lord Hardwicke's opinion, was "the most unguarded and audacious that he had ever seen[3]," was increased by the fact that the paper which contained it was one of a series of articles, full of gross calumnies and abuse, one of which had for its subject the loves of Mortimer and Queen Isabella with indecent reflexions upon Bute and the Princess of Wales[4].

A few days later, on April 28, a general warrant, which contained no names, but which directed the arrest of the authors, printers and publishers of the *North Briton*, was issued by the

[1] Below, p. 487.

[2] *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1332.

[3] Below, p. 488.

[4] Walpole's *George III*, i. 141; T. Wright, *England under the House of Hanover*, i. 403.

Secretary of State, Lord Halifax, and Wilkes was brought before him, together with 48 other persons, and thence removed to the Tower as a close prisoner[1]. Wilkes had long been a supporter of Pitt, had greatly contributed to Lord Bute's fall, and had been secretly instigated in his attacks and slanders upon the minister by Lord Temple[2], who now publicly appeared as his patron, visited him at the Tower and applied on his behalf for a writ of *Habeas Corpus*, not to Lord Mansfield, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, according to long established legal usage, but to Sir Charles Pratt, at the Common Pleas, who was known to be a faithful follower of Pitt and to share his popular views in legal matters, and who furnished Pitt with legal arguments to employ in the House of Commons in their support[3].

Wilkes was brought before Pratt on May 3, 1763, and on May 6 was discharged on his privilege of Parliament, it being held by the Judge that libel was not a breach of the peace and that privilege extended to all offences not a breach of the peace, treason or felony[4]. "Now did the Court," says Walpole, "feel the consequence of having forced Pratt to be Chief Justice against his will." According to Wilkes, Pratt was now "adored"; and Wilkes's release was accompanied by an outburst of popular applause which resounded through Westminster Hall, where seditious handbills were distributed even in the presence of the Lord Chancellor[5].

These scenes were followed by a series of further triumphs in the law courts. On December 6, Wilkes finally obtained a verdict for £1000 damages and costs against Robert Wood, the under Secretary of State, on which occasion Pratt declared the general warrant to be unconstitutional, illegal and void, and the jury acquitted Wilkes of being the author of the *North Briton*, No. 45[6].

"In the proceedings," wrote Wilkes to Lord Temple, on July 9,

[1] Walpole, *George III*, i. 219 sqq.; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 140 sqq.

[2] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 57, 60 sqq.; *Hist. MSS. Comm.* Rep. iv. 400. It is true that he declined for himself and Pitt, in letters to Wilkes, any approval of the "paper war," and of some of Wilkes's extreme audacities, but there is reason to suspect that this disapproval was only simulated and intended for the Post Office, where his letters were continually opened. A very convenient and opportune discovery of these dissuasive letters was made when Wilkes's papers were seized by the government. See *Chatham Corr.* ii. 193; *Grenville Papers*, i. 456 sqq., 459, 460, 489; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 178.

[3] Below, pp. 488, 492; Walpole, *George III*, i. 220; Chatham MSS. 25 and 74.

[4] Below, pp. 491–2; N. 263, ff. 215 sqq.; H. 52, f. 54; *State Trials*, xix. 95; Walpole, *George III*, i. 220 sqq.

[5] Below, p. 494; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 71; H. 284, ff. 2 sqq.

[6] *Annual Register*, vi. 145; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 184 sqq.; *State Trials*, xix. 1153–76.

1763, "the Attorney General highly condemned the *North Briton*, for private scandal, for attacking public characters, for creating disunion between England and Scotland—the major part of which he believed well affected—and said that lenity had been mistaken for weakness, that the attack had at last reached the Throne itself, the sacred person of the King; talked of the brevity which became Royalty, etc.; that he had exhibited an information against me to which I did not think fit to appear voluntarily; that it ill became him to act contrary to the jurisdiction of a supreme Court to take out the compulsory process[1]; that the King acquiesced; that this question was between government and faction, between order and confusion, etc. in defence of the King's honour, with an infinite deal of other trash. He was personally very civil[2]."

A number of further actions brought by the printers and others, who had been arrested, were also successful; all the plaintiffs obtained damages, and a verdict against Lord Halifax himself was only avoided by obstructive delays till Wilkes was no longer in a position to carry on the prosecution[3].

The authority of the government was now openly despised, and Wilkes proceeded to publish reprints of the *North Briton* in volumes with further new matter[4]; while later the public burning of the *North Briton*, No. 45, on December 3, by the hangman, which had been ordered by the Parliament, was interrupted and prevented by the mob. A jackboot and petticoat, emblems of Bute and the Princess of Wales were consumed instead, and the riot was instigated and encouraged by persons of position. The opposition gained much in strength by these events. They were now furnished with a national and constitutional ground of attack, instead of one mainly personal; and there appeared every probability that the administration would be overturned, and that the King would be compelled to call in the Whigs and abandon his attempts at arbitrary government.

Lord Hardwicke, indeed, greatly desired the removal of the present ministers from office and regretted the imprudence of their proceedings, which seemed exactly calculated to inflame popular opinion, place the government in a false position and defeat every useful aim, and which differed so greatly from his own conduct in similar circumstances; for this had always been marked by an

[1] Below, pp. 498 and note, and 502.
[2] Below, p. 509; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 72; N. 264, f. 339; *Rockingham Mem.* i. 168.
[3] Below, pp. 509–11; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 230. [4] *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 203.

unwillingness to enter into such contests with the press, by great caution and moderation in instituting prosecutions, by an employment only of the ordinary process of the law under which in fact Wilkes was eventually convicted[1], and by a scrupulous regard for the legal rights of the accused.

He, however, held rigidly aloof from the agitation, and it was in vain that Wilkes tried to secure his support by ostentatiously reviving and censuring in the *North Briton* of September 25, 1762, a supposed former caricature of him by the painter Hogarth, where he had been represented as "a great spider in a large thick web, with myriads of the carcases of flies, clients I suppose, sucked to death by the gloomy tyrant," the original author of the simile having been "the great Mr Fox who, in one of the debates on the Marriage Bill, compared the Court of Chancery and its proceedings to that nauseous insect[2]." "If the interpretation be true," wrote Lord Hardwicke coldly, "it was below so great a genius in burlesque as Mr Hogarth to borrow so low and stale an image from an old forgotten rant in the House of Commons[3]."

The cry of "Wilkes and Liberty," which thrilled Pitt and Lord Temple, was not one by which he could be inspired. The libel published he could not excuse or extenuate. He could not countenance the support given to the unscrupulous libertine and adventurer, who, by his own admission, "was resolved in this time of public dissension to make his fortune[4]," and to the rabble which followed him, or approve of this appeal to popular passions against the King and the government, against law and order and public decency, or condescend to the employment of such instruments in such a cause. "After having been Attorney-General ten years," he wrote to his eldest son, "Chief Justice between three and four years and Chancellor almost twenty, I shall not now contradict all the principles, and all the rules of law and order, which I have been maintaining all my life[5]." The foolish clamour against the Northern Kingdom, which he had laboured all his life to unite by the

[1] Below, p. 498 *n.*

[2] Royston to Birch, H. 51, f. 363.

[3] N. 257, f. 378; also H. 51, ff. 362, 364 and above, vol. ii. p. 65; H. 5, f. 308. Hogarth had been appointed Serjeant Painter to the new King. He moreover had a grudge against the Court of Chancery on account of his copyright act having failed there. Austin Dobson, *W. Hogarth* (1907), 40, 123. The caricature, however, does not appear in Hogarth's print of the *Times*, the object of Wilkes's attack and, according to Birch, the drawing, which had been made some years ago, had never been published. Lord Royston disbelieved the whole story (H. 52, f. 102).

[4] E. Gibbon, *Miscellaneous Works* (1814), i. 142.

[5] Below, pp. 491, 494–5, 501.

strongest ties to England, he condemned severely, and showed his disapproval publicly by addressing a letter to the President of the Court of Session, repudiating for himself any part in such proceedings[1].

Nor could he give any countenance to the new and specious maxims of law and of the constitution, which were now laid down by the popular Pratt in Westminster Hall, and proclaimed by Pitt with all the arts of oratory in the House of Commons. The recent judicial proceedings, indeed, raised several questions involving principles of the greatest importance, which could not be abandoned merely to serve a political turn.

The practice of the Secretary of State in issuing warrants had been generally allowed and had been often recognized in the Courts of Law. Lord Hardwicke himself, as Lord Chief Justice in the *King* v. *Earbury*, had laid down that the right of the Secretary of State to apprehend persons suspected of treason had been settled by the case of the *King* v. *Kendall and Roe* in 1695; this right was recognized by Pratt now in the case of *Entick* v. *Carrington*; it was confirmed later and it still exists[2]. But the custom of issuing *general* warrants did not admit of equal justification. The execution of these warrants, in which no names of persons were stated, together with full discretion as to arrest and search, were entrusted to the messengers and inferior servants of the Secretary's office; and these were powers which obviously might easily be abused and which, in the hands of an unscrupulous or nervous minister, or one too subservient to the Crown, might become a dangerous engine of tyranny. The practice was undoubtedly at variance with the Common Law and a violation of all the charters of liberty from Magna Charter down to the Revolution. It was based on prerogative, as Lord Hardwicke pointed out, and dated from a period when the exercise of the executive power was more extensive and less subject to the restrictions of the law than was the case later[3]. At the same time, it was a power which, as was proved from numerous precedents, had been exercised by the Secretary of State with general consent, not only in early times but continuously since the Revolution[4].

[1] Below, pp. 503–5.

[2] *State Trials*, xix. 1044, 1046, xii. 1359; Broome, *Const. Law* (Denman), 611 sqq.; Lord Campbell in *Harrison* v. *Bush* declared that the Secretary of State is "a magistrate and has a power of commitment to prison by warrant for just cause." Ellis and Blackburn, *Reports* (1856), v. 353.

[3] Below, p. 494.

[4] Below, pp. 481, 495.

But the charge originally preferred against Wilkes by the Secretaries, of treasonable libel, had been altered, after consultation with Charles Yorke, and in accordance with his Father's opinion[1], to that of seditious libel, the former presumably not being justified by the offence; and there appeared to be no sufficient precedents for the summary action of the Secretary in these cases, which differed greatly, in their nature and in their gravity, from those of treason; nor had the Courts of Law apparently ever countenanced the exercise of such powers in cases of sedition. The counsel therefore for the Crown in the subsequent cases of *Entick* v. *Carrington*, and *Leach* v. *the King's Messengers*, could only argue upon general grounds that there was equal justification for the action of the Secretary in cases of seditious libel, since this offence, equally with treason, undermined the government and disturbed the public peace[2].

The advantage of leaving large discretionary authority to the executive for use in times of crisis and public danger could not be doubted, but the recent abuse of these extreme powers was too flagrant to be defended; and in the actual political circumstances there was every reason to expect that further and worse acts of tyranny and prerogative, unless prevented, would follow. The Courts of Law were practically unanimous in pronouncing them to be illegal; and Charles Yorke, on the question being debated in the House of Commons, took the lead in explaining the injustice of the general warrants and in moving for their prohibition in the future[3].

On this subject, therefore, there was no great divergence of opinion from that of Pitt and the popular party; but on other points which arose, there existed fundamental differences, which proved impossible to reconcile or accommodate.

A decision given by Pratt in accordance with his practice on previous occasions[4] and in deference to Pitt's opinions, which left the whole case, including the points of law, to the jury to decide, instead of restricting their verdict to the points of fact, met with Lord Hardwicke's strong disapproval. In political matters he

[1] Below, pp. 480 and *n.*, 490–1, 494.

[2] *State Trials*, xix. 1013, 1040, 1044.

[3] Below, p. 480.

[4] *E.g.* in conducting the cases of Alexander Murray (1752) and Shebbeare (1758), he urged the right of the jury to give a general verdict. See also his and Pitt's unwarrantable attack on Lord Mansfield on this point in the House of Lords later. Stephen, *Crim. Law*, ii. 325.

might, he said, defer to Pitt's opinions, but "he would never act so mean a part as to give up...all the principles [of]...public order and good government in complaisance to any man[1]."

The restriction of the jury to a verdict on the facts he regarded as a fundamental principle, both of law and of government. It was one which he had maintained consistently throughout his long legal career, and notably, as Attorney-General, in the celebrated trial of the *Craftsman* in 1731, when it was firmly established by Chief Justice Raymond[2]. In the first place, the duties of the juries, being by the ancient constitution primarily those of witnesses, were confined properly to the verdict of fact, those of the judge to the explication and interpretation of the law[3]. To cease to distinguish between these functions was to break off from the natural and historical development of the law, which would entail mischief and confusion.

Further, he esteemed the reservation of the point of law to the judge, especially in libels against the administration, a necessary security for government and public order. His view was upheld by his great successor, Lord Mansfield, and by later judges, till it was overborne by the fallacious eloquence of the brilliant Erskine, and, in spite of the opinions of the judges of that day, destroyed by the Libel Act, 32 George III, c. 60, in 1792, which allotted to the jury the duty of returning a general verdict, at the same time retaining the direction of the judge, if he should think fit to give it[4]. Some time, however, had then elapsed, and the open discussion of public affairs had by that time lost its chief dangers and inconveniences owing to the existence of a more discreet, responsible and experienced press and of a less ignorant and barbarous public, so that the action of the law of libel had become practically restricted to offences against individuals[5]. Thus the mischiefs and dangers formerly feared by Lord Hardwicke have happily not been realised to their full extent. In our own times, however, it has been found necessary occasionally to withdraw cases from the juries, when they could not be trusted to return just verdicts without fear or favour. The capacity of the people for government, and with it their responsibilities, widen slowly as knowledge and civilisation extend, and duties, which have been left

[1] Below, pp. 501, 509–11.

[2] See above, vol. i. pp. 86 and 125; Stephen, *Hist. of the Crim. Law* (1883), ii. 321.

[3] *Ib.*, 350; *State Trials*, xvii. 672.

[4] *Speeches of Thos. Erskine* (1810), i. 264; Stephen, ii. 325 sqq., where the whole subject is discussed at length.

[5] Stephen, 301.

to them safely in more modern times, could not have been entrusted to them earlier without risk, in a period marked by a low standard of education and intelligence and of disaffection to the government, and when the great fabric of the state was not yet settled firmly on its foundations.

Lord Hardwicke was as little in sympathy with the licence which, under the specious name of liberty, was now claimed by Pitt[1] for an anonymous and indecent press, unrestrained by any regard for truth or by any sense of responsibility which alone have made possible the freedom enjoyed in our own times. Such publications in a more backward state of civilisation and knowledge have an influence especially pernicious and extensive, and uncontrolled by the law and exempt from all fear of punishment may, proceeding from one infamy to another, become the greatest tyranny which can possibly be inflicted upon a community.

To the judgment of Sir Charles Pratt, moreover, on the strength of which Wilkes had been liberated, that libel was not a breach of the peace and that the defendant was therefore covered by his parliamentary privilege as member for Aylesbury, which thus conferred a license upon all members of Parliament to print and publish what they chose, Lord Hardwicke could by no means assent. It violated another legal principle on which he had acted during his whole tenure of office, one in his judgment essential to the maintenance of public order and security, and which had been followed and supported by Charles Yorke in the indictment of Wilkes[2]. The warrant had in the first place been drawn up in the Secretary's office without consulting the Attorney-General, and had then contained the charge of treason which, in accordance with his opinion, was subsequently altered to that of seditious libel as falling equally outside the parliamentary privilege. The opinion was overruled by Pratt, but was largely quoted as Lord Hardwicke's by the supporters of the government in their defence[3].

Lord Hardwicke, however, throughout his own career, had invariably discouraged any discussion concerning the powers of Parliament in the Courts of Law, and had himself always avoided deciding such points and even giving opinions thereon in writing[4].

[1] Below, p. 501, and cf. vol. i. p. 85.

[2] Vol. i. pp. 81, 85, 127; Blackstone, *Comm.* iv. 150; Ridgeway, *Reports*, 102 *n.* The more modern doctrine, however, seems to regard libel as not a breach of the peace but only tending thereto.

[3] Below, pp. 489–90; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 148.

[4] Below, p. 489, and see vol. i. pp. 124–5.

"Mr Yorke," writes the second Lord Hardwicke, "still continued in the office of Attorney-General and that necessarily engaged him in the prosecution of Wilkes for the famous No. 45, when he gave his opinion in concert with Sir Fletcher Norton, Solicitor-General, on the point of privilege ['that the *North Briton*, No. 45, was an infamous and seditious libel,' and that 'the publication of a libel, being a breach of the peace, is not a case of privilege[1]']. Webb[2], then Solicitor to the Treasury, brought it to my Father in Grosvenor Square, who, after reading it over, said to him, 'Pray, Mr Webb, carry it back to my son, and desire him forthwith to come to me.'—Webb was too eager and officious towards his new superiors to comply with the request of his old patron and benefactor, and went with the paper directly to the Secretaries of State, and in consequence of it Mr Wilkes was apprehended. My Father had not the least doubt of the legality of the opinion, and always maintained it firmly and strongly to the day of his death; but he thought it was a delicate question for the Crown lawyers to give written opinions upon, and that the Attorney and Solicitor should have talked with the King's servants first, and endeavoured to conduct the business in a way less liable to clamour. I had this anecdote from Mr [Charles] Yorke a winter after[3]." Lord Hardwicke also urged that the matter should be referred to the officials of the House of Commons, not only to obtain information but as a proper mark of respect to Parliament; and the advice of the former experienced Speaker, Arthur Onslow, was now sought[4]. Eventually the matter was debated in the House of Commons, the most proper place for its discussion, when it was decided, in opposition to Pratt's judgment, that privilege did not extend to seditious libel.

Meanwhile, the Cabinet patched up by Bute had shown signs of collapse. George Grenville proved almost as unpalatable to the King as a Whig ministry. With great "ingratitude" he had shaken off Lord Bute's influence, the maintenance of which had been the chief aim in handing over to him the government, and instead of the docile and obedient servant expected, he had proved exceptionally obstinate, as well as prosy, and had frequently opposed the royal wishes, till at length the King declared that he "would rather see the Devil in his closet than M[r] Grenville[5]."

[1] *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 147.
[2] Philip Carteret Webb, joint Solicitor to the Treasury. See note, vol. ii. p. 355.
[3] H. 80, f. 5; below, p. 489. [4] Below, pp. 489, 492.
[5] *Rockingham Mem.* ii. 50; Add. 34,713, f. 277.

His authority and that of the two Secretaries of State had also received a serious blow, and the King's confidence in them had been much diminished by the failure of the proceedings against Wilkes.

Bute, accordingly, returned from Harrogate, resumed his influence over the King[1], and immediately began the task of arranging a new government. By the King's command, and in spite of Grenville's "positive and repeated advice," a special attempt was made to induce Lord Hardwicke to return to the government[2]. Lord Egremont had paid him a long visit on May 13, 1763, when the state of public affairs had been discussed. Lord Hardwicke had severely criticised the exclusion from the government of so many persons, whose cooperation was essential, as well as the attempt to destroy the "honourable connexions" and "necessary engagements," which were condemned under the names of party and faction, but without which individuals could not enter the King's service or right measures be executed. On the occasion of a subsequent visit in June, Lord Hardwicke dwelt on the great perils now confronting the ministers and the storm gathering over their heads[3]. On August 1, Lord Egremont, by the King's order, invited Lord Hardwicke to join the Cabinet as President of the Council in place of Lord Granville, whose death had just taken place. As a great concession a Court place was promised for the Duke of Newcastle. The advancement of Sir Joseph Yorke to the secretaryship of state was, it appears, also contemplated[4]. "Lord Hardwicke," writes George Grenville, "at once rejected the offer and said they would never come into office, but as a party and upon a plan connected with Mr Pitt and the great Whig Lords, as had been practised in the late King's time. That King William had been forced to a change of ministry, so had King George the Second, who had thanked him, Lord Hardwicke, for advising him to it[5]."—"The right way was to advise the King to go roundly and at once to the root of the evil." To this it was answered that the King would never be persuaded to take in an opposition party[6]. Separate proposals had been made by Lord Bute to Pitt in June, which were in like manner rejected[7], and

[1] Below, p. 508.

[2] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 191.

[3] N. 264, f. 226; below, pp. 495–8, 512–6.

[4] *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, G. Aitken, Rep. xii. app. ix. 337; H. 52, f. 113.

[5] This probably refers to the taking in of Pitt in 1757 and not to the incident of 1746.

[6] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 83, and 191 sqq., Grenville's *Diary* whose account, doubtless derived from Lord Egremont, is here given. Cf. Lord H.'s own narrative, below, pp. 512–5, and N. 265, f. 1.

[7] Below, p. 509.

in August to the Duke of Bedford[1], and according to Walpole to the Duke of Newcastle[2].

Meanwhile Lord Egremont's death had taken place on August 21, and the relations and negotiations between Pitt and Bute, of which the exact nature and duration are obscure, had developed or been renewed, and on August 25 Pitt received a visit from the Favourite, which ended with satisfaction to both parties. On August 27 Pitt was summoned to an audience with the King, when "Mr Grenville, arriving at Buckingham House, was struck with the apparition of Mr Pitt's chair in the court," "the foot of which," as Pitt himself declared, "made it as much known as if his name was writ upon it[3]." The situation of affairs was discussed and persons were mentioned for the chief offices, including Lord Hardwicke as President of the Council; and Pitt left Buckingham House with the full assurance that the King intended to carry the new plan into execution. On the next day he visited the Duke of Newcastle at Claremont, and the Duke and Lord Hardwicke were summoned to London immediately.

In the interval, however, the King's disposition had completely altered. According to the courtiers, to whom the King talked with great imprudence and with no reserve after the incident, the cause of the failure was Pitt's "exorbitant" demands, such as "could only be expected to be granted by a King in Carisbrooke Castle[4]." But it is beyond doubt that the real reason was the King's unwillingness to take in Pitt with the Whig Lords, on which Pitt insisted, and which would have acknowledged the complete victory of the opposition and admitted once more the party system, and with that, in the King's view, have entailed his own subjection. The negotiation with Pitt had the same object and intention as those previously with the other Whig leaders, namely, to detach and separate them one from the other, to admit one or two but by no means to accept them as a party, and to preserve at all costs the Court system. The King in fact told George Grenville, that "he meant to do it as cheap as he could, and to make as few

[1] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 194–5; Wiffen's *Memoirs of the House of Russell*, ii. 526; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 237; *Lord Shelburne's Life*, i. 281 sqq.

[2] Walpole, *George III*, i. 225.

[3] Below, p. 526; Walpole, *George III*, i. 228; *Letters*, v. 365; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 90 sqq., 196, 204.

[4] Below, pp. 523 sqq.; H. 52, f. 119; Walpole, *George III*, i. 229; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 218 sqq.; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 235 sqq.; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 104 sqq.; *Lord Shelburne's Life*, i. 288 sqq.; Phillimore's *Mem. of Lyttelton*, 645.

changes as was possible[1]." Shortly afterwards, in a conversation with Sir John Phillips, M.P. for Pembrokeshire, the King declared, "that he was resolved never to take them into the administration as a party...but that he might possibly, if they returned to their duty, employ some of them," and added, "Remember, Sir John, when you see me next, you will find me the same firm man you leave me[2]." The first interview with Pitt had left him "a good deal confused and flustered[3]." In the interval he reflected, and his fears were increased by Grenville's representations and by those of Bute himself, whose power under the new plan would have entirely disappeared. At the next interview, therefore, with Pitt, on August 29, when it was expected that the list of the Cabinet would be settled, the King abruptly broke off the discussion, declaring that "his honour was concerned, and he must support it[4]."

The dignity of the Crown was greatly lowered by these transactions, and the King was now placed in a humiliating situation. He had applied to the Whigs in turn behind the back and against the advice of his actual responsible ministers, had been refused by all and was in these circumstances obliged to petition George Grenville, fated ever to appear as a makeshift, to continue in office. The latter, not unnaturally indignant at the public depreciation of his own power and at the recognition given to Pitt's, consented on the condition only that Lord Bute, whose conduct cannot be easily reconciled with the promises and assurances made on his retirement of remaining aloof from public affairs, should retire altogether from the Court, and cease all further interference with the administration[5].

The complete failure, however, of these plans, and the injury inflicted upon the royal authority by these ill-advised proceedings, did not deter the King from continuing the same unfortunate course of intrigue. The disunion and confusion occasioned amongst his ministers was apparently regarded by him as an advantage rather than as a mischief, as making all more completely dependent upon himself. Proceeding with the same hopes of dividing the Whigs and inflaming their jealousies, he took care immediately to communicate to Charles Yorke the proposal made by Pitt, in his audience, of making Pratt a peer and of calling him to the Cabinet

[1] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 195.
[2] *Ib.*, ii. 118.
[3] *Ib.*, ii. 196.
[4] Below, p. 527.
[5] Above, p. 386; *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 221; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 89–98, 101, 106, 192 sqq., 201 sqq.; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 250–1.

Council, at the same time promising the Attorney a peerage eventually for himself, if he would remain in office[1]. Legge in the same way received intelligence of Pitt's omission of his name in his recommendations to the King[2]. The Duke of Bedford, who had himself urged the King to summon Pitt to the Cabinet, was likewise informed, through Lord Sandwich, of Pitt's refusal to admit him into his administration[3], and influenced now by anger and resentment consented, on the condition of Bute's retirement, to himself preside over the Cabinet as President of the Council[4]. Lord Sandwich became Secretary in the place of Lord Egremont, Lord Bute was forced to relinquish his last office, that of the Privy Purse; and an incongruous and incapable administration was patched up, which lasted, in spite of constant squabbles for place and power[5], for a few months longer.

The failure of the negotiations of the Court with Pitt renewed the Duke of Newcastle's desire to organize an active and vigorous opposition, while the violent hostility against the government, caused by the Wilkes proceedings, greatly increased the chances of success.

Lord Hardwicke was placed in a difficult situation, disapproving of much in the conduct and views of both parties, condemning in the highest degree the new system of government introduced, and strongly attached to the Duke of Newcastle by ancient ties and obligations, but suspicious and distrustful of his great ally, the Duke of Cumberland, divided from Pitt on important points of public policy and family interest, devoted loyally to the young King, wishing well to any ministers whom he might employ, and disapproving of all organized opposition against his administration[6].

The position of Charles Yorke, still Attorney-General, engaged to a government of whose acts he could not approve and which had carried out a wholesale proscription of his friends, was still more embarrassing, and made doubly perplexed, since retirement and a union with the opposition seemed only likely to involve him in worse entanglements. On the great point of privilege, now coming into Parliament, he was entirely with the government. There was no leader on the side of the opposition who could

[1] Below, p. 537. [2] N. 266, f. 268.

[3] Below, p. 506; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 238; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 247; Walpole, *George III*, i. 230 sqq.

[4] Below, p. 530; *Bedford Corr.* iii. 238 sqq. [5] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 206 sqq.

[6] Cf. Walpole, *George III*, i. 243, who as usual ascribes all the hesitations of the family at this time entirely to self-interest.

inspire confidence. Charles Yorke had little in the old Duke of Newcastle; while he naturally felt, and had expressed, the greatest repugnance to become a mere follower and adherent of Pitt[1].

His retirement from office at this time, indeed, seemed to support no definite principle or party, while at the same time it ruined his professional prospects; for the favour of the Sovereign, once lost, would in all probability prove a bar to future promotion, and unsupported by any connections, he must sink to the insignificance of a private individual.

Pitt's insistence on the severance of Charles Yorke's interest at Court was the more ungenerous, because he himself refused to depart from his trimming attitude. He had maintained an understanding with Bute, and in the list of names, which he submitted to the King, it was noticed that Bute's friends were specially excepted from the proposed dismissals[2]. He took great care to avoid offending the King. Indeed, Pitt's conduct had the ugly look of a *guet-apens*. If, as the Duke of Newcastle, an experienced hand in intrigue, pointed out, Charles Yorke might have a personal motive in clinging to office, Pitt might hope that, if he identified himself with the opposition, Pratt would gain the advantage over him[3].

Some months previously, on June 7, 1763, Pitt had sought an interview with the Attorney-General, for whom, according to Lord Temple, who prepared the ground beforehand, he "had always had a hankering[4]." Pitt had then spoken of their former friendship, which he declared to be unbroken by political estrangement, and had assured him of his support in preference to Pratt, with the proviso only that Charles Yorke's promotion might be accomplished with Pratt's acquiescence and approval, of whose friendship and respect he assured the Attorney, and a union with whom offered so many advantages to the latter and to the public. At the same time, Pitt explained away his former disavowal of party connections and dismissed the differences of opinion, which had already appeared in the Wilkes case, as of little consequence[5].

But Lord Hardwicke himself spoke of these assurances a little cynically. "It may be very sincere," he wrote to the Duke of Newcastle, "but I own it smells a little of that holy water, which

[1] Above, p. 413.
[2] Cf. above, pp. 430, 469 and below, 509; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 200, 243.
[3] Below, p. 537.
[4] Below, p. 499.
[5] Below, pp. 497–9, 503, 506–8; N. 265, f. 8.

great men are apt to sprinkle, when they have a mind to baptize others into their political faith." The elaborate attempt now made to effect an intimate union between his son and Pratt he treated with some contempt, as unnecessary and inconvenient. Pitt, indeed, intended to offer his support on the condition only of the surrender by Charles Yorke of all his convictions, and to exact an impossible and unworthy submission to his own views and projects, which entailed the repudiation of definite opinions and principles held and maintained while in office. Such rapid changes, in similar circumstances, were not unknown in Pitt's own career, and possibly appeared to him practicable and excusable. "My son, however," wrote Lord Hardwicke, "will never submit to act such a part...he would lose all character for ever[1]."

Pitt's attitude, moreover, was soon completely altered in consequence of the private negotiations with Bute and of renewed hopes in August of being called to the government by the King. On August 11, the Duke of Newcastle describes him as completely changed in disposition, and instead of good humour and an inclination to make light of differences of opinion, and to renew the friendship and union with Charles Yorke, which he had exhibited at the last interview, nothing was heard now but declamations upon liberty and privilege, extravagant eulogies upon Chief Justice Pratt and reflections upon the Attorney-General, whose persistence in opposing his views and coldness in receiving his advances, it now appeared for the first time, had determined him to try no more. Considerable jealousy was also exhibited regarding the visits paid by Lord Egremont to Lord Hardwicke[2]. In the scheme of administration which Pitt submitted to the King in August, Pratt was proposed, as we have seen, for a peerage and to be "brought forward," with a seat in the Cabinet, while Charles Yorke's name was not even mentioned[3]. A further interview between Pitt and the Attorney-General, on October 12, only widened the breach between them. Contrary to everything that he had said in the former interview, the offence of Wilkes was now made by Pitt the principal point, and without agreement on the subject of privilege all cooperation and all organized opposition were declared to be impossible[4].

In these circumstances, after much anxious doubt and hesitation and consultation with his Father and the Duke of Devonshire, and

[1] Below, pp. 503–4, 539.
[2] Below, pp. 516–23, 532.
[3] Below, pp. 533, 537; Walpole, *George III*, i. 232; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 199.
[4] Below, pp. 533 sqq.

in view of the repeated proposals made to the Whig Lords to return to office and the improbability of the duration of the present feeble ministry, Charles Yorke determined to postpone his resignation, on the understanding that, should the present system of government be continued, he should join the opposition[1]. Some, like Horace Walpole, attributed his hesitating conduct to small and unworthy personal motives, but it is remarkable that by the general public justice was done to his character and he was treated, although the principal antagonist of Chief Justice Pratt and the popular view, with respect and consideration and, unlike the Solicitor-General, no hostile manifestations were made against him[2].

At length the failure of the negotiations with the Whigs, and the reestablishment of the administration on its former weak and narrow basis, put an end to all hopes; while the scandal of the Whig proscriptions, and the pressing instances of the Duke of Newcastle together with Lord Hardwicke's firm attachment to the latter, or what the second Lord Hardwicke calls the "point of honour," prevailed over all other considerations.

On November 3, accordingly, Charles Yorke, after a meeting with the Dukes of Newcastle and Devonshire and Lord Rockingham, resigned his office, being followed a few days afterwards by John Yorke, who quitted his place at the Board of Trade[3]. "He assigns no reason for it whatever," wrote George Grenville, "but the distance of his Father, Lord Hardwicke, and his friends from the government. I have expected this step for some time and therefore am not at all surprised at it, though I am sorry that he thought himself obliged to take it."—"He was above half an hour in his [the King's] closet, expressed himself with the greatest duty and affection to the King, put the step he had taken entirely upon his Father, under the Duke of Newcastle's influence, lamented the extremities to which this had drove him in this final step, showed great reluctance in the doing it and burst out into tears. The King answered him firmly, and said his future conduct must be the rule by which he must judge of what he had said to him. The King reported the whole conversation to Mr Grenville, said that Mr Yorke had described Mr Grenville to him...as a man whose integrity, ability and firmness must do honour to any administration....The King told Mr Grenville one circumstance, which he said he would tell to no other person whatever viz: that Mr Yorke had dropped

[1] Below, pp. 507, 520–1, 530. [2] Below, p. 510; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 233.
[3] Below, pp. 539 sqq., 553; Walpole's *Letters*, vi. 11; N. 267, f. 70.

the word, *If any circumstance should ever bring him back to His Majesty's service*, to which His Majesty returned no answer[1]."

Charles Yorke's own account was somewhat different. According to this narrative, he explained to the King that he had remained hitherto in his service, hoping that the ministry would have been settled on firm foundations by a union with his friends, without which no stable government could be formed; and since the proscription of these continued, the whole history of whose ill-treatment he recapitulated, he could stay no longer. As for the case of Wilkes, his opinion would be the same out of office as in it—"The King said with great emotion, 'M^r^ Yorke, I am very sorry to part with you. Your friends are much obliged to you. And I hope they will give you that support, which you deserve from them for what you are now doing[2].'"

"As the session of Parliament, which was to meet in November 1763, approached," writes the second Lord Hardwicke[3], "the opposition grew more inflamed on this point of privilege and the other appendages to Wilkes's case. Lord Hardwicke was embarrassed about the conduct of his family. The Duke of Newcastle and his other friends, he knew, strongly wished for their resignations. He did not in his own judgment approve the plan of conduct which was formed by opposition, and detested such brutal and personal attacks as those with which the *North Briton* abounded: neither did he think it becoming at his time of life to counteract those ideas of law and order which he had been labouring all his life to establish. At last, however, the point of honour prevailed, and in compliance with his sentiments, my brothers, M^r^ Yorke, and M^r^ John Yorke gave up their employments just before the Parliament met. The former resigned his [on November 3] after a long audience, in which His Majesty was pleased to use many gracious and affecting expressions with regard to himself and the family in general. How well they have been verified the sequel of this narrative will show[4]. Sir Joseph Yorke was never called upon to give up his honourable and advantageous station at the Hague, nor did Lord Hardwicke ever seem to intend he should. I much question whether, had it been proposed, Sir Joseph would have complied. He has all along kept out of the way of our dissensions at home, and never passed above two months in his own country from that time to this [1771][5].—

[1] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 149, 218.

[2] Below, p. 548; H. 80, ff. 66, 70.

[3] H. 80, f. 6.

[4] The reference is to the tragic events which preceded the close of Charles Yorke's life in 1770.

[5] His recall was, however, urged upon the King but was successfully opposed by Grenville at that moment "when Lord Hardwicke's life was despaired of, and when lenity to Sir Joseph might be the means of his being a bond of union and conciliation for the rest of the family, after Lord Hardwicke's death." *Grenville Papers*, ii. 219, 221.

I have often since thought it would have been the wisest measure if Mr Yorke had either resigned, when so many of the Duke of Newcastle's friends were turned out for voting against the Peace, or not at all. In the former case he would have had merit with them and not have been involved in the troublesome prosecutions about Wilkes; in the latter, he would only have continued to support his opinion in office, which for his own credit he was obliged to do out of it, and his line of promotion in the profession would never have been broken. Whereas by the part he took, neither side thought themselves much obliged to him. But, as I said before, the point of honour, and our good Father's inclination, turned the scale....

It was impatience from *peine d'honneur* in my Father," he writes elsewhere[1], "which at this time brought about my brother's resignation. I was not then for it, and thought it would have been better to have done it when the Duke of Newcastle was forced to quit, and my Father was left out of the Council, than after he had gone on for a twelve-month in the King's business, had no public point to stake his resignation upon, and was to differ with his friends in a nice and material question of privilege of Parliament in the case of a libel. Had he been in Lord Camden's way of thinking[2] on the subject, it would have become him to have thrown up his office. But circumstanced as he was then, and my Father in his last moments, it only led us into further embarrassments."

Charles Yorke's momentous decision, however, was greeted with great applause. An ovation awaited him on his first appearance in Westminster Hall after the announcement, and he was at once granted by unanimous request a precedence below the bar[3]. But he began almost immediately to regret the step which he had taken, in deference to his Father's wishes; and as the event proved, the sacrifice was useless[4].

He was unable to identify himself with the aims and principles of the opposition, and his resignation in no way satisfied Pitt, who now declared that it "might do more hurt than good," and "complained extremely" of him[5]. Pitt was now greatly influenced by the hope of returning to power through the King's favour, upon whom he believed he had made a good impression in his recent audience[6]. He resumed his "impracticable" attitude, and once more positively declined, in spite of the representations of the Whig Lords and the Duke of Cumberland, to lead or join an opposition, or attend any more opposition dinners, which now had the appearance of "faction[7]."

[1] H. 10, f. 409. [2] Charles Pratt, afterwards Lord Camden.
[3] Below, p. 554. [4] Below, pp. 539, 544, 551–2. [5] N. 267, f. 166.
[6] Below, p. 547; N. 266, f. 150; N. 267, f. 166.
[7] Below, pp. 530 sqq.; N. 267, f. 166.

Immediately upon the reassembling of Parliament, on November 15, Charles Yorke, in supporting the Speaker on a point of procedure in connection with Wilkes's privilege, found himself in opposition to Pitt and was violently attacked by the latter[1]. In the debate the next day Pitt made an "obscure speech," "praising everybody and everything," declared that "he stood single," and pronounced "the King's Speech the best he ever heard from the throne, and the Address [in which occurred the words "safe and honourable peace" and though these he could not allow,] the properest and the most temperate." This gave the ministers great satisfaction[2].

Meanwhile, the debate on the main question of privilege was postponed owing to the absence of Wilkes, who had been obliged to fight a duel and had been severely wounded, and the Speaker's and Lord Hardwicke's illness, the latter preventing the attendance of Charles Yorke, which was particularly desired by the King and the government[3]. "In the evening [November 17] Mr Harris came to Mr Grenville and told him he had just seen Mr John Yorke who, with tears in his eyes, came to tell him that Lord Hardwicke was dying, or at least so ill that he feared he would not recover; that in this situation his brother, Mr Charles Yorke, was apprehensive he could not go down to the House of Commons to follow up with spirit, as he meant to do, the great question of privilege which was to come on the next day; that he wished to support and maintain with strength the opinion he had given; that he was most highly offended with the unworthy usage he had met with from Mr Pitt; that [at ?] his treatment of him the first day of the session, with an intent to ruin him with the Parliament, after having done him all the mischief he could with the King, by urging his Father upon the subject of his resignation; that for these reasons Mr Charles Yorke wished if possible, that Mr Grenville would put off the question of privilege till another day[4]."

The debate accordingly did not take place till November 23, when Charles Yorke and his two brothers voted against the Court in favour of a further postponement, till Wilkes should be able to attend, and on the ground of the prejudice which a decision in Parliament against the privilege would inevitably create against the

[1] Lord Barrington to Mitchell, Add. MSS. 6834, f. 56; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 223; Walpole's *George III*, i. 249; *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Marquis of Lothian, 248.

[2] Walpole's *George III*, i. 253; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 164 *n.*, 224.

[3] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 163; *Commons Journals*, xxix. 673.

[4] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 225.

offender in the Courts of Law, where he was summoned to appear on his trial for libel. On this occasion he gained much applause from Pitt[1]. But on the main question, which was debated the following day, he delivered a great speech of two hours on the other side, against the extension of parliamentary privilege to libel, as being a breach of the peace. "Charles Yorke," wrote Walpole, "shone exceedingly. He had spoke and voted with us the night before, but now maintained his opinion against Pratt's. It was a most able and learned performance, and the latter part, which was oratoric, uncommonly beautiful and eloquent....That speech was certainly the masterpiece of the day[2]." He was answered by Pitt, who declared that if libel were not covered by privilege, every member, who voted against the government, ran the risk of imprisonment, and reflected upon the conduct of the crown lawyers by whom, he insisted, the King had been ill served. "Mr Yorke," wrote Warburton to Ralph Allen, "never distinguished himself to so much advantage on the court side of the question and against the party he has gone over to, as on this occasion. He was universally applauded, and Mr Pitt appeared to be so much nettled that he abused the lawyers in general, who that day were all against him[3]." At 9 o'clock George Grenville "went out of the House of Commons, and wrote three lines to tell his Majesty how well Mr Yorke had acquitted himself, and that Mr Pitt had spoke, but had made no impression on the House[4]."

The right of privilege was finally renounced by the Commons by 258 votes to 133[5], and in the Lords, on November 29, a similar resolution was passed by 114 to 35, in spite of Pitt's efforts, who had assembled the Whig peers before the debate and engaged them to vote on his side and against Charles Yorke[6]. Among the minority in the Lords, who voted with Pitt, was the Duke of Newcastle who, however, at a subsequent meeting at Devonshire House, refused to sign the protest, "on account of his friend, Lord Hardwicke, who had declared his opinion against privilege[7]."

[1] Below, p. 556; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 228; Walpole's *George III*, i. 258.

[2] *Letters*, v. 399; cf. *George III*, i. 259, where the description is carefully composed, less spontaneous and far less appreciative. "Charles Yorke under the difficulties of disgusting his Whig friends and of serving a court with which he was dissatisfied, explored all the sources of distinction and law subtleties to defend his opinion against privilege; and spoke for two hours with great applause as excellent in that branch of his profession."

[3] *Warburton's Papers*, ed. by F. Kilvert, 232.

[4] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 229.

[5] Walpole, *George III*, i. 257 sqq.

[6] Below, pp. 552, 555; Walpole, *George III*, i. 254; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1365.

[7] *Hist. of the Late Minority*, 241–5.

The differences between Pitt and Lord Hardwicke and his family were thus increased, and Charles Yorke was again once more drawn towards the government. "Mr Yorke came in the evening [of December 17] to see Mr Grenville," writes the latter, "and had a long conversation with him, the sum of which was to advise him to enlarge the bottom by taking in aids from the opposition. Mr Grenville always represented that this could not be done without changing the government, which he by no means thought expedient, but should always be ready to receive individuals as occasion should offer. Mr Yorke laid great stress upon the clamour of the people, which Mr Grenville showed him could not be appeased by any change of ministers, since it was no longer a cry for the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Hardwicke or even Mr Pitt, but for Pratt and Wilkes. Mr Yorke spoke rather discontentedly of the exigency of the times, which has (as he called it) *whirled* him out of so eminent and advantageous a post in the law[1]." Little was done to repair the breach with Pitt, though it was remarked that Pitt now treated Charles Yorke in the House of Commons with a civility, forbearance and deference rarely observed by him towards an opponent[2], and though Charles and his brothers in the new session, which opened with the New Year, occasionally voted against the government[3], and the former took a leading and independent part on the side of the opposition in the great debate on February 13, 1764, and subsequent days on the subject of general warrants.

"When appearances of amendment," writes Lord Hardwicke's eldest son, "gave us opportunities of conversing with him on public affairs, he seemed most entirely to approve of the proceedings of Parliament in Wilkes's business, and to be very angry with his old friends for not supporting his and my brother's opinion on the question of privilege; at the same time that, being unwilling to leave them on points where he could heartily concur, he advised us to vote against general warrants, which we did in two very near divisions in the House of Commons[4]."

According to the original motion, "a general warrant for apprehending the authors, printers and publishers of a seditious libel, together with their papers, is not warranted by law." It was

[1] *Grenville Papers*, ii. 239.
[2] Below, pp. 557–8.
[3] Walpole, *George III*, i. 282; but see N. 270, ff. 234, 354, 383.
[4] H. 80, f. 7.

expanded by one amendment to include treasonable libel, and by another the words were added, "although such warrant hath been issued according to the usage of office, and hath been frequently produced to, and so far as appears to this House, the validity thereof hath never been debated in, the Court of King's Bench."

The motion and amendments were supported on February 17, by Charles Yorke, who did not procure the inclusion of the last clause without some altercation with Pitt who, however, abstained from pressing his views to a division. Pitt, says Walpole, did not oppose the amendments, "because Charles Yorke gave in to them; for it is wonderful what deference is paid by both sides to that house[1]."

Sir Fletcher Norton, the new Attorney-General, moved the adjournment of the debate for four months on the ground of the cases then pending in the law-courts, and that a declaration of the law should not be made by one House alone, but in Westminster Hall by Act of Parliament; and affirmed that were he a judge, he "would pay no more regard to the resolution than to that of a drunken porter," a saying which deeply affronted the House and was long remembered against its author.

Charles Yorke, in a long speech which made a great impression, strongly opposed the delay. He had always considered this a question fit to be discussed and decided by Parliament, which in such matters ought to hold the balance between the King and the people; and separating himself from the Attorney-General, declared that, were he a judge, he should treat with respect the decision of the House of Commons, to which it was his greatest pride to show regard and devotion. In point of law it was impossible to support general warrants, which dated from the Star Chamber. The warrant issued against Wilkes was undoubtedly illegal; and alluding to his own conduct in the matter, he declared that, though he had given his opinion that No. 45 was a libel and had advised the commitment of Wilkes to the Tower, presumably with the view of prosecution by the ordinary legal methods, he had never seen the warrant till after the arrest[2], nor had the question been submitted to the law officers of the Crown by the ministers[3]. "Mr Yorke," writes his eldest brother,

[1] *Letters*, vi. 9.

[2] According to Walpole (*George III*, i. 299), who attributes Charles Yorke's conduct and opinions entirely to opportunism, this was merely "advising a man to knock down another, and then pleading that he had not seen the bludgeon."

[3] The facts were as follows: on April 25, 1763, Lord Halifax, the Secretary of State,

"spoke on that subject, as he had done before, most remarkably well about the privilege business[1]." "Nothing ever met with such applause," wrote a spectator of the scene, "Pitt is in love with him, and so are we all[2]." Pitt, ill and exhausted from the long attendance, spoke at three in the morning. He placed the matter in its true light by showing that illegal acts of the executive, such as the general warrants, which, as a search had proved, had occasionally been issued by himself, might be excused on the plea of necessity in times of crisis, but could not be justified as the ordinary machinery of domestic government. The summary arrest of a suspected French or Jacobite emissary was an act which stood entirely in a different category from the late proceedings against Wilkes. "The apparent necessity of the thing and the real exigency of the time, must always be the test and alone vindicate and be the safeguard of any minister who, at a crisis, exceeds the known laws of his country." Pitt, however, could not conclude his speech without playing to the gallery, and indulging in popular clap-trap and abuse of the judges, whose opinion in support of general warrants had been quoted. "He was no judge," he declared pompously, "but sat there to judge judges. There had not been a violation of the Constitution but had been sanctified by the greatest judges."

The debate was continued till five in the morning, when the ministers carried their motion for postponement by a majority of only 232 to 218, Charles Yorke and his two brothers voting in the minority[3].

So close a division was almost a defeat for the administration, and had it been followed up with energy the ministers might have been driven from office. The government, however, had now obtained a respite from the attacks of Wilkes, who had been convicted of a breach of privilege by the Lords on account of the

submitted No. 45 to the Attorney and Solicitor General for their opinion. On April 26 he signed the warrant for the search and the arrest of the offenders on the charge of treason and sedition. On April 27 the law officers replied that the paper was "a most infamous and seditious libel," punishable as a misdemeanour by "due course of law." On April 28 Lord Halifax delivered the above-mentioned warrant to the messengers for execution. On April 29, on the persons being apprehended, the law officers gave their opinion that Wilkes's arrest was good notwithstanding his privilege, and on April 30 that libel is a breach of the peace and therefore not covered by privilege. Add. 22,132, ff. 4 sqq.

[1] H. 80, f. 7. [2] Below, p. 564.

[3] Below, pp. 562 sqq.; Add. 6834, f. 63; N. 271, f. 118; Walpole's *George III*, i. 286 sqq.; *Letters*, vi. 3 sqq.; *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1398 sqq.; *Grenville Papers* ii. 261 sqq.

obscene and blasphemous "Essay on Woman," and who was expelled the House of Commons and obliged to retire abroad. The debates, moreover, though so far successful, had not effected any real union amongst the Whigs. Lord Hardwicke and his son were displeased with the compliance shown by the Duke of Newcastle and the majority of the party with Pitt on the subject of privilege[1], and Pitt, after this outburst of zeal and a further abortive movement towards reconciliation with Charles Yorke, cancelled all promises and repudiated all ties with Lord Hardwicke's family, and relapsed again into seclusion and inaction, leaving the opposition more defenceless than ever against the government, and exposing the country to the greatest perils from the continuance in power of the present incompetent administration[2].

Once more the eyes of those, who had their country's interest most at heart, were turned towards the great man, who at more than one crisis in the national history had, by his influence and authority, overcome faction and internal discord and united all parties for the preservation of the state. "In the present uncertain and confused state of things," declared the former Speaker of the House of Commons, Arthur Onslow, "he could not conceive a wish more for the service of the public, as well as of the King, than that His Majesty would desire Lord Hardwicke to form a ministry for him[3]." But the present circumstances differed greatly from those in which his intervention on former occasions had proved successful; and now the strong hand which, with its firm grasp, had for so many years supported the affairs of state and guided the fortunes of his family, had begun to fail and relax.

At the beginning of October in the previous year Lord Hardwicke had been attacked, while in London, by an alarming illness, accompanied by fever and prostration. It was at first thought to be a recurrence of the complaint which had troubled him some years before[4]. In reality it was a much more deadly one, that of an internal swelling of a cancerous nature[5]. The worst symptoms, however, this time disappeared quickly, and the nature of the illness not being understood, it was believed that he was making a

[1] Walpole's *Letters*, v. 438–9.

[2] Below, p. 565; Walpole, *George III*, i. 303. There is a large gap here in the *Chatham Correspondence*, where there is nothing printed between February 20 and July 4, 1764.

[3] H. 52, f. 141.

[4] Below, p. 553; Walpole, *Letters*, v. 410.

[5] H. 881, f. 150.

LORD CHANCELLOR HARDWICKE

FROM A PORTRAIT BY WILLIAM HOARE R.A.

thorough recovery and that the chief danger was past. Sir Edward Wilmot declared on October 31, that the "foundation of his illness is quite removed, and there is great reason to think his health will be soon re-established, if it be not interrupted by politics which may agitate his mind, break his rest and retard his recovery[1]." His family took courage, and the Duke of Newcastle and his friends congratulated themselves on his preservation[2]. On November 30, Charles Yorke reported his pulse as "strong and regular, his countenance good and his discourse and head quick and clear. The strength of nature is great, and may carry him through—God prosper all the means[3]." "God Almighty," wrote his old comrade, the Duke of Newcastle, "has made in him, I had almost said, a most perfect man. For the spirit, strength and steadiness, with which he has gone through such a long and dangerous illness, shows that the strength of the body is as great as of the mind[4]."

On December 5, he was "impatient to be well," and on the 8th "felt himself recovered." Towards the end of the month, the Duke of Cumberland proposed to pay him a visit to explain his attitude and conduct[5].

On the last day of the year he was carried downstairs, and next day the Duke of Newcastle was allowed to visit him for half an hour. "I saw yesterday," he writes, "a most surprising, but most agreeable sight. My great and valuable friend, my Lord Hardwicke, who after *four months* confinement for a most painful and dangerous disease is at his age so far recovered as to be able to come downstairs; his looks and voice almost the same they ever were; his spirits and vigour of speech almost the same, and no other complaint at present but great weakness of body and inability to walk without assistance which, by the advance of the season and proper exercise, I hope in God, will soon be removed[6]." On January 8, 1764, he sent out cards of thanks for inquiries[7].

"We will hope," wrote Mrs Elizabeth Carter, "a good constitution will at last bring him through his attack. Never indeed did the blessing of such a life appear to be more necessary to the public than at present[8]." "For several days past," wrote her correspondent, Catherine Talbot, another old and devoted friend of the family,

[1] N. 267, f. 160, and ff. 316 sqq.
[2] Below, p. 560.
[3] Below, p. 558; N. 268, ff. 117 sqq.; N. 270, f. 50.
[4] H. 81, f. 149.
[5] Below, p. 559.
[6] N. 270, ff. 344, 352.
[7] N. 270, f. 146.
[8] *Letters*, ed. by M. Pennington (1808), i. 564.

"Lord Hardwicke has had few alarming symptoms, but every day diminishes his strength and gives more fears than hopes; those who attend him hope still, and I sometimes flatter myself that so valuable a life will still be spared to a country, which so much wants such a true friend as he has always been to it. All you say of him is most perfectly just. Had he been taken off by a sudden stroke, one should have felt the shock severely; yet there is something peculiarly painful in the thought of such a one lying ill and inactive so long; though, as I hope and dare say he makes the right and best improvement of these first tedious hours he ever knew, this is probably best for him, as well as for those nearest friends who, by alternate hopes and fears, are thus gradually weaned from the happiness to which they have been so long accustomed[1]."

Meanwhile Lord Hardwicke's prostration did not deter the Court from organizing bitter attacks upon him, and indeed appears to have instigated them. No office, with the exception of Sir Joseph Yorke's embassy, being held either by himself or his sons, it was not easy to strike with effect; but a point of attack was chosen on which it was supposed that he would feel keenly. On February 9, a movement, with the support of Lord Holland and others, was begun against the great Marriage Act, which had been his work and which was now defended by his sons with the general support of the opposition; and on March 6, the very day of his death, the committee of the House actually reported in favour of its repeal, a proceeding, however, which led to no practical consequences[2]. At the same time another attack was made upon him and his family. Without waiting for his death, an urgent canvass was begun in the University of Cambridge to secure the office of High Steward for Lord Sandwich, now Secretary of State, and to exclude Lord Royston. The King himself, who had at first not wholly approved, interfered to support Lord Sandwich's candidature, and condescended to allow his name to be employed in menace and in bribery to influence the voters. The scandalous claim of so unworthy a successor, one not only a notorious profligate and as such unfitted in the highest degree to represent a seat of education, but who had recently in the Lords covered himself with disgrace by treacherously exposing the ill-doings of his

[1] *Letters*, ed. by M. Pennington (1808), i. 561.

[2] Below, pp. 562, 564; H. 13, f. 59; N. 271, f. 208; Walpole's *George III*, i. 282, 285; *Commons Journals*, xxix. 826, 912, 929.

associates for a political purpose[1], occasioned almost universal disapproval. The incident formed the subject of Churchill's poem *The Candidate*. "Though I have a very indifferent opinion of my Alma Mater," wrote the aged Lord Chesterfield, "I can hardly think that she will stain her annals with the name of Lord Sandwich when she may adorn them with that of Lord Royston[2]." In the event, the election of Lord Royston was only effected by a majority of one vote, and not without an appeal to the courts of law. The indecency of the proceeding, the injurious treatment, in his last hours, of the great man, whose life had been a long devotion to the King and the country, aroused general astonishment[3]. "I never," writes Lord Royston of his Father, "knew him express more resentment in my life than when he once, in conversation with me, touched upon the strong part which the King was said to have taken in support of Lord Sandwich in the contest for the High Stewardship[4]."

Such were the incidents with which Lord Hardwicke's great career was closed, and the last tribute to his services and to his memory paid by his Sovereign. About the middle of February the former alarming symptoms returned, and this proved the final relapse. The good fortune, however, which had attended him through life, did not now desert him. He suffered little except from weakness and sleeplessness, and his mind continued clear. At the beginning of March his physical powers began slowly to sink, and he passed peacefully away at a quarter-past-three in the afternoon on March 6, in the 74th year of his age.

His sons record that "he had the felicity to expire without pain," and that he died "serene and composed. I saw him in his last moments, and he looked like an innocent child in his nurse's arms. Alas for his family and country!"—"The hand of God has kindly removed him, *suo tempore, alieno Reipublicae*[5]."

"He died," writes his eldest son, "without leaving any *testament politique* for our future conduct, or taking any formal leave of us. In the last days of his illness he declined talking at all, and seemed

[1] Walpole, *George III*, i. 245 sqq.

[2] N. 271, f. 112.

[3] Below, p. 561; Walpole's *George III*, i. 267, 314 sqq.; *Grenville Papers*, ii. 227, 236, 494; N. 270, ff. 123, 259, where it is stated that one Lushington, an army chaplain and supporter of Lord Royston, was ordered to repair to his regiment in Ireland, while the King through Sir James Lowther promised Dr Law, a voter for Sandwich, that he would "certainly take care of him."

[4] Below, p. 561; H. 80, f. 7.

[5] Below, pp. 565–6; H. 4, f. 438.

heartily tired of life, the two last years of which had been embittered with many incidents of mortification and chagrin. I cannot help thinking they had preyed upon his mind, more than his natural composure would permit him to show outwardly....It is much to be wished that he had left tracts behind him on historical, legal or moral subjects. The result of the sentiments and reflections of so long, so busy and so unblemished a life, would have been inestimable heir-looms[1]."

He was buried on the night of March 15, following the express directions in his will, "privately and without pomp, in the vault adjoining to the parish church of Wimpole, next to the corpse of my late dear Wife," a large number of his tenants attending the coffin from Royston[2].

According to his will, his estates were entailed upon all his sons in succession and their male descendants, while the lands, with the exception of the mansion house and grounds at Wimpole, might be leased for a term, not exceeding 21 years. He had already, during his life-time, bestowed their separate portions upon his sons and daughters, and by a later codicil he granted to James £1000 more and a further £400 a year to Joseph and to John in case they were excluded from the King's service. He left legacies to Wimpole and the adjoining parishes, to Dover and to Hardwicke and to St Thomas's and St George's Hospitals, and to Archdeacon Plumptre and to his cousin and godson, Philip Yorke of Erthig. He desired his executors to set up a monument to himself and to his wife in Wimpole Church, and "would have it decent but not magnificent, and the inscription modest."

"Lastly I do earnestly recommend it to all my children and grandchildren to live in perfect unison and harmony with one another, as the surest way to secure and advance their most essential interests[3]."

[1] H. 80, f. 8.
[2] Wimpole MS.
[3] H. 881, ff. 46 sqq., 147, from the draft will with MS. alterations in his hand.

Correspondence

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 238; N. 263 f. 105.] Claremont, *April 10th*, 1763.

My Dearest Lord,

The Attorney-General...has made me the happier by a short visit of one hour this morning than I have been for this twelve months past. The wise, the honest, the clear part which he took in his conversation with my Lord Bute[1], and his kind declaration to me that he would have nothing to do with these people, has made me quite easy; for I have long had no other view but to act in concert with and by the approbation of my best friends. He dines with us tomorrow.

I find the new ministry, as I mentioned, put their strength upon Lord Bute's (the obnoxious man) having nothing to do. That must be contradicted; for it is impossible to imagine that he could have left such a ministry as this, if it was not with the hopes of governing them, and of resuming the administration, whenever he should find a proper opportunity. The Attorney-General and the Duke of Devonshire...both agree with me that there is nothing to be done but to remain thoroughly united, and to unite absolutely with Mr Pitt.

After this new arrangement of George Grenville etc., you will have no difficulty with Mr Pitt, as you will judge by my letter from him, a copy of which I send your Lordship[2]....

Holles Newcastle.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N 263, f. 188.] Grosvenor Square, *April* 30, 1763.

...I suppose your Grace has been informed ere now of the only news of the day, or indeed of the week, which will probably make a great deal of noise. Your old friend Carrington[3] has found a way to beat up Mr Wilkes's head quarters, and either last night or this morning seized the press, then employed in printing off the *North Briton* for this day, and several original papers and letters in Wilkes's handwriting, particularly, as it is said, the original of the *North Briton* of Saturday last relating to the King's Speech, which was the principal object. I own I was amazed at that paper when

[1] Above, p. 385.

[2] N. 263, f. 84, in which he hints at G. Grenville's unfitness for his great office and appoints a meeting with the D. of N.

[3] Nathan Carrington, one of the Secretary of State's messengers.

I read it, as being the most unguarded and audacious I had ever seen. Hereupon both Mr Wilkes and Mr Kearsley[1] have been taken into custody, and were this morning to be carried before the two Secretaries of State to be examined....I suppose in taking him up they have gone upon the general exception out of privilege, *of treason, felony and breaches of the peace.* I have not heard they have seized any papers of the handwriting of any other person.

After I had writ thus far, I received further intelligence that the two Secretaries of State have committed Mr Wilkes to the Tower for being the author and publisher of *a certain, treasonable and seditious libel* viz: the *North Briton* of Saturday last. He would answer no questions, but insisted upon his privilege against being committed for a misdemeanour, as a member of the House of Commons. Whether there was any other reason for sending him to the Tower besides that prison being the prison to which the House of Commons commit their own members, I know not. I am told that Mr Wood[2] and Mr Webb[3] went along with Carrington to Wilkes's house and found Lord Temple with him, and that the latter argued with them against the proceeding, and entered into the point of privilege. Within an hour or two afterwards a motion was made in the Court of Common Pleas, before Lord Chief Justice Pratt, for a *Habeas Corpus* for Wilkes, and Lord Temple appeared in Court upon the Bench when the motion was made. The writ was granted and he is to be brought up on Monday next, as it is said. The making such motions in that Court is very unusual, such applications being generally and usually made in the Court of King's Bench, but that Court was declined in the present case[4]. Some people wonder that Lord Temple chooses to appear quite so forward in this affair, considering the nature of the particular paper in question.

Another remarkable transaction has happened this week. The directors of the East India Company are going to call in question Lord Clive's grant of his *Jaghire*, or great rent reserved out of the lands granted to the East India Company, which was given him by the Nabob. It amounts to £28,000 or £29,000 per annum. They have sent an order to their Governor and Council of Bengal to remit no more money to his Lordship on that account, but to retain it in the

[1] George Kearsley, the publisher of the *North Briton.*

[2] Robert Wood (*c.* 1717–1771), the traveller and author of the *Ruins of Palmyra*; under-secretary of state and M.P. for Brackley; he was fined for his proceedings on this occasion.

[3] Above, vol. ii. p. 355.

[4] See p. 460.

Company's cash and to keep a distinct account of it. I had this from Lord Clive and his father, who called upon me to discourse about it; but they either could not, or were not willing to, tell me what pretence of right was alleged for this proceeding[1]....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Attorney-General

[H. 5, f. 316.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, Saturday, *April 30th*, 1763.

DEAR CHARLES,

Mr Webb has been with me, and given me some account of what has passed. At my desire, he showed me your opinion in writing about the point of privilege[2], which is always delicate; and therefore we used to avoid giving opinions in writing about privilege. For this reason I desired Mr Webb, if possible, not to produce the opinion; or if he did, to take it back, or to manage it properly. The privilege has been variously laid down, sometimes with an exception of *treason, felony, and breach of the peace*; and sometimes of *treason, felony and sureties of the peace.* But your report is agreeable to the report made by Sir Tho. Lee in Mr Onslow's case, which you will find entered in the [Commons] Journal, 20 May, 1675; printed *Journals,* vol. 9, page 342. I desired Mr Webb not to mention my name; but to hint to the Secretaries of State to consult the Speaker[3] (which I believe has been usually done in such cases), and he will probably consult Mr Onslow. I put Mr Webb in mind of Sir Richard Steele's case[4], who was expelled the House for his letter to the Bailiff of Stockbridge, at the latter end of Queen Anne; but I do not remember that he was taken up. That was indeed during the session, and here the 40 days *redeundo* are not expired since the prorogation[5]. I take it for granted that Mr Wilkes will refuse to give bail, which makes this a point which should be thoroughly considered. The present arrest may be considered as only in order to examination, so that it is open to the Secretaries of State to do as they shall judge proper

[1] See above, p. 258.

[2] Dated April 27, Add. 22,132, f. 30.

[3] Sir John Cust.

[4] Sir Richard Steele (1672–1729), the celebrated author and collaborator with Addison in the *Tatler* and *Spectator*, M.P. for Stockbridge; wrote *The Importance of Dunkirk Considered* against the Tories in 1713, for which and for *The Crisis* he was expelled the House of Commons on the charge of seditious libel in 1714.

[5] The privilege of Members of Parliament extended outside the duration of the session to a period during which the members travelled to and fro.

afterwards. In all events they should consult the Speaker; perhaps not so much for the light they will gain, as for decorum to the House. I write in haste, and am

Yours affectionately,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Attorney-General

[H. 5, f. 318.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, Sat. night, *April 30th*, 1763.

DEAR CHARLES,

Since I saw you Jack told me that the two Secretaries have made the warrant of commitment against Wilkes, for being the author of a *treasonable* and seditious libel. I see now the reason for insisting so much on that word, which I suppose was to take it clearly out of the case of *privilege*, which certainly cannot extend to *treason*.

But abstracted from that, a case has occurred to me of a prosecution, in my own time, against a member of the House of Commons, for a misdemeanour of an infamous nature, as a libel is also supposed to be. It is the case of John Ward, of Hackney, for *forgery*. After a verdict and judgment against him, I laid a copy of the record before the House, and he was expelled upon my motion. I know he was not in custody during the proceeding, and believe he gave bail; but of this I will not be sure upon my memory. I was ordered by the House of Lords, by an order made upon hearing his own appeal, to prosecute him for the forgery, and thereupon I filed the information in my own name. I believe he came upon the *venire* [*facias*] or *capias*[1], and put in bail; but this Mr Webb, or the clerk in court, may find, as I suppose, by searching the recognizances of that time, in the Crown Office in the King's Bench. The year was 1724 or 1725, but I believe the latter, and possibly the proceeding might run into 1726. I think this will be a material case for your purpose, and possibly to be quoted in the course of the motion in the Common Pleas.

I am always,

Your very affectionate

HARDWICKE.

P.S. I desire you will take a note out of this letter, and then burn it; for I have nothing to do in this affair.

[1] Names of the writs.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 263, f. 201.] CLAREMONT, *May* 1, 1763.

...I always feared that the *North Briton* of Saturday last would bring on some examination and prosecution. To be sure it was wrote with very little consideration or caution....

...My Lord Middleton, my nephew Townshend Junior and my nephew Onslow are come in from London. They all agree that the city and suburbs are in the utmost alarm at these proceedings, which they call illegal and oppressive....Lord Temple is very full of taking the strongest part, and wants us all to go to see M^r^ Wilkes in the Tower. His Lordship went yesterday there, but was *refused admittance*....For God's sake turn these things in your thoughts and consider what it may be right to do....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 263, f. 199.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *May* 1, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,

I write this only to thank your Grace for your letter which I have this moment received, and to take the liberty to give you a caution not to suffer yourself to be too much possessed and warmed by the discourse of the zealous young gentlemen, who have been with you this day. The libel is certainly not only unjustifiable but inexcusable. I return your Grace inclosed the copy of the first warrant which, whatever objections there may be to it, I believe is the form which has often been made use of in the office, perhaps in your Grace's own time. My Lord Chief Justice Pratt might probably not be acquainted with it, for I do not remember there was any prosecution for a libel whilst he was Attorney-General.... All I mean is that we should not too hastily make *cause commune* with M^r^ W[ilkes].

I am, my dearest Lord, ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Attorney-General

[H. 5, f. 322.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, Monday evening, *May 2nd*, 1763.

DEAR CHARLES,

M^r^ Onslow has been with me, and I found him in a more moderate and reasonable way than I expected. I could perceive that my last night's conference with the noble Duke [of

Newcastle] had produced a good effect, for his Grace had seen several of the gentlemen this morning.

The nature of the libel, as it regards the King personally, as now explained to them, strikes many of them in a way they did not feel before. I sounded him about his *father*[1], and he says that he has been searching into the point of privilege these two days; that he can find no precedent in point, and is rather balancing; but is inclined to be of opinion that privilege does not extend to the case....He told me a circumstance, which I never heard before, that the word *treasonable* is left out of the commitment to the Tower[2].

Don't mention your having any of these circumstances from me, but burn this letter as soon as read.

I am, yours affectionately,

... HARDWICKE

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 342.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *May 3rd*, 1763.

DEAR ROYSTON,...

I was from the first astonished at that paper of April 23rd. The whole affair is matter of much observation, and makes a great noise; the rather as the Court of Common Pleas is not the usual Court to apply to for such a writ of *Habeas Corpus*; and I believe there has not been one of this kind moved for there since the year 1670. I suppose they are now debating there whilst I am writing....

Attorney-General to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 5, f. 325.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *May* 3, 1763, 3 o'clock Tuesday.

MY LORD,

I am glad to find that your Lordship is making a proper use of this fine day by going abroad. My meaning in calling here was only to acquaint your Lordship that Wilkes's case has been argued today in the Common Pleas.

The Court were of opinion that the *first* return by the messenger was bad; because it did not set forth to whom he had delivered over the party.

[1] Arthur Onslow, the former Speaker and a great authority on parliamentary questions.
[2] Above, pp. 464, 480 *n*.

To the *second* return made to the *second* writ by the Lieutenant of the Tower three exceptions were taken[1]. 1. That the warrant of commitment did not appear to have proceeded upon an information or charge on oath. 2. That the libel was not set forth in the warrant, which was necessary, in order to guide the judgment of the Court in taking bail, where the offence was bailable. 3. That the commitment was in the case of a member of Parliament during time of privilege....Serjeant Glynn[2] insisted that the exception out of the privilege was to be understood only of *actual* breaches of the peace. And so it was laid down by Lord Hardwicke in Lord Tankerville's case, in the House of Lords, upon his complaint of service of a rule of B.R. [King's Bench] to show cause why an information should not be granted against him for bribery in an election[3].

By what I can learn, this point of privilege has been very slightly spoke to without learning on either side. The Court have remanded Wilkes till Friday, that they may consider the several exceptions. When he came into Court, he made a speech, complaining of hard usage; at the conclusion of which, as well as at his going away, there were such shouts in the Hall and in the Court of Common Pleas that you would have thought the Seven Bishops had been acquitted[4].

Hon. John Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 26, f. 200.] SPRING GARDEN, *May* 3, 1763.

DEAR BROTHER...

The motives to which it [*i.e.* Lord Bute's resignation] is generally imputed are want of health, the uneasiness of his family, his unpopularity every day increasing, the disinclination of many of the King's servants (I must not call them colleagues) to support

[1] The first writ of *Habeas Corpus* was directed to the messengers but they replied that Wilkes was no longer in their custody, being then in the Tower; the second was issued to the Lieutenant of the Tower.

[2] See note, p. 509.

[3] The under-sheriff and sheriff's officer, who had arrested Lord T., were taken into custody by the serjeant at arms (*L. J.* xxix. 354, June 6, 1758). This case was much relied on by Pratt in support of his view. He sends it to Pitt, adding, "Lord Hardwicke held in the House of Peers that Lord Tankerville was entitled to his privilege, and that *contra pacem* in these indictments was a constructive breach of the peace only, and that privilege was to be denied in no cases but where there was an actual breach of the peace." (Chatham MSS. R. O. 74.) He also quotes the case in court "as upon record in Parliament," in support of his judgment (*State Trials*, xix. 992). But there is no record of Lord H.'s opinion in the H. of L. Journals either printed or MS. or in the Minute Books, nor could there be any such *record* of the opinion of an individual peer in debate. Moreover, this was a case of bribery, not of libel, and, as Lord Hardwicke points out (H. 5, f. 324), the privilege involved in this case was that of the peerage, not that of parliament.

[4] Quam dispar occasio! [is Lord Hardwicke's comment, H. 4, f. 342].

him and the base desertion of others, meaning, I suppose, Lord M[ansfiel]d. But tho' all these have doubtless their share in the event, yet I have all along thought, that something sudden and immediate must have hastened the birth of it. I have heard from two very different channels that Lord Bute was alarmed at some discoveries he made of backstairs intrigues and cabals in her M[ajest]y's apartment. I am pretty well assured that Lady Egremont is the undoubted favourite there, and that the Q[ueen]'s influence increases daily. If this is so, I should not wonder that Mr G. Grenville and Lord Egremont should have turned the balance in their own favour, and that his Majesty should appear to be tolerably easy. It is thought that Lord Bute has left Lord Gower about the Royal Person, as his substitute, and one on whom he can rely[1]....Lord Holland has broke with all his old clan and quarrelled even with Calcraft. He seems, by the accounts I hear, to be eat up with spleen and despair at being obliged to give up his importance in the world, tho' he disgraced himself every day by his conduct....The town has swarmed with silly reports about Lord Hardwicke and his family. Nothing has been said to him, and therefore they are all fictions....It is reported that Lord Bute set out for Harrogate yesterday and his case is worms. If Wilkes had heard of that some time ago, I think he would have given him a touch upon it in the *North Briton*. That gentleman has at last contrived to be taken up and sent to the Tower....He was taken up upon the opinion of the Attorney and Solicitor. The town has divided them in opinion as usual, and made *Peter* much the most violent, I dare say without foundation*....

Daniel Wray to Lord Royston

[H. 53, f. 270.] *May* 6, 1763.

My Dear Lord,

This morning Wilkes's affair was ended in the Common Pleas....He made a short speech to thank the Court and his Counsel, and then turned about and made a low bow to the crowded audience which filled the Hall. This occasioned such a shout as reached the Exchequer[2], and called us all down from our seats. The handbills, which you see in the papers, were distributed even while Lord Chancellor was passing, who called to the Constables to seize the fellow, but all he got was a curse upon such law and such lawyers. It is wonderful to consider the crowds this business has collected and the eagerness it has introduced into conversation....

[1] Granville Leveson-Gower, 2nd Earl Gower, afterwards 1st Marquess of Stafford.

* Peter Bull-Calf a nickname for Sir Fletcher [Norton]. H. [(1716–1789) succeeded Charles Yorke as solicitor in 1762 and as attorney-general in 1763; speaker of the House of Commons, 1770, and later 1st Lord Grantley. He was a rough, violent man; another nickname applied to him was "Sir Bull-Face Double Fee," in allusion to his supposed avarice and effrontery.]

[2] Wray was Lord Royston's deputy as Teller of the Exchequer. See note, vol. i. p. 213.

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 349.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *May 10th*, 1763.

DEAR ROYSTON...,

I don't find that any further steps have been taken in Westminster Hall since his [Wilkes's] discharge by the Court of Common Pleas, upon a point of privilege never yet asserted by the House of Commons themselves. Your observation upon the word *treasonable*[1] is very just, and it was contrary to *some* advice given....

Your maxim of *via trita via tuta* is generally good, but not always so in the Secretary's office, where some of their forms were settled in times of a more rigorous and extensive exercise of power....The whole of the affair, and the violent fermentation raised upon it, give the true friends of the King and his government very serious reflexions, and ought to induce them to concur in proper methods to calm and cure it.

You may possibly have read in the papers of my having what is called *an opposition dinner*. There is no truth in it; for I had only half a dozen particular friends—the Duke of Devonshire, the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Bessborough, Lord George Cavendish, and the Attorney-General. After having been Attorney-General ten years, Chief Justice between three and four years, and Chancellor almost twenty, I shall not now contradict all the principles, and all the rules of law and order, which I have been maintaining all my life....

Your most affectionate Father,

HARDWICKE.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 263, f. 275; H. 74, f. 242.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *May* 13, 1763.

...This day at noon I had *my visit* [from Lord Egremont][2]....It began in the style of the letter which your Grace saw—professions of general respect and civility and desire to see me before I went out of town, thinking I was going for the summer. After these civilities were over on both sides, we fell upon the never-failing and inexhaustible topic of Mr Wilkes. I found my visitor was very sore with it, but talked with prudence and moderation upon the

[1] As ill-advised, H. 4, f. 344.

[2] Charles Wyndham, second earl of Egremont (1710–1763). Secretary of State, 1761–3; married Elizabeth, sister of Lord Temple and George Grenville; he died shortly after this, on August 21.

subject, owning at the same time that his Master was extremely hurt and provoked with it. This I could not wonder at, and you may be sure that I did not make myself a partisan of Mr Wilkes, but I avoided giving an opinion upon any point; and to do my visitor justice, he did not push for it. We then fell upon the general state of things, both of us lamenting the present violent and disturbed situation and fermentation. I took the liberty to blame with some freedom the narrow plan upon which this administration was formed, and the proscriptions which were given out in the world to be fixed upon certain persons, as being directly contrary to the King's plain interest. He professed to wish of all things to see the bottom widened, that he saw the interest of the King and the public in it and nothing could possibly give him so much pleasure. As to *proscriptions*, he hoped none were so fixed as to be irreversible; but he owned that, as to *two persons*[1] (whom your Grace will name to yourself without my doing it), he believed his Master would run great risks before he would submit to admit them, and whoever should venture to propose it would pass their time very ill. I need not relate to your Grace what I said of the impropriety and the blameable part in anybody to instil into the mind of a Prince an absolute determined exclusion of any men or set of men, whom the circumstances of things might make necessary, to restore tranquillity to his government, especially in this country, liable as it is to popular turns, which sometimes made it necessary for Kings to ply for their own sakes. He gave me to understand, without directly saying it, that, as to those he called my friends, there would be no insuperable difficulty, but that the triumphant procession into the city[2] *manet alta mente repostum*, and has been frequently mentioned to himself, and particularly revived and aggravated by the countenance now given to Wilkes. In order to dash any hopes of making a division, I said that he knew as well as anybody that in this country there were such things as honourable connexions, which some might represent under the odious name of faction, but might really be only necessary engagements in order to carry on and effectuate right and necessary measures; that by breaking through such honourable connexions, (if supposed practicable), individuals might be gained, but they would come naked and be rendered unable to serve either the King or themselves. He seemed to understand and feel the weight of this.

[1] Pitt and Lord Temple; above, p. 458.
[2] Above, p. 281.

The rest of our conversation was general, but something was thrown out about the incredulity of the world that Lord Bute was really and absolutely retired, and the general opinion that he still acted as powerfully as ever behind the curtain. He professed not to have discovered any traces of that kind since he went to Harrogate, but owned to me full as much of what had passed before as your Grace told me Lord Halifax did to Mr Legge, and just in the same sense. He also made full as strong declarations of his own positive determination, the moment he should make any such discovery, to have nothing more to do, as that Lord had done to Mr Legge. He added that he knew Lord Halifax was in the same resolution.

This is the substance of what passed material;—the rest was paper and packthread. He said at parting that, as I was going to Wimpole for three weeks, he would after my return come to me some evening and have a full conversation which, being going to Court to attend upon the Venetian ambassadors, he could not have now. The strongest assurances were given on both sides of absolute secrecy, and saying nothing of what had passed or our being to meet again. Therefore I must insist that nothing of this, even loose as it is, be mentioned to any, even the most confidential of our friends....Ever yours,

HARDWICKE.

Your Grace was mentioned with great respect but without anything specific.

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 355.] WIMPOLE, *May 17th*, 1763.

...One of my great pleasures here is being free from the noise and eternal talk about Mr Wilkes....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 246; N. 264, f. 5.] CLAREMONT, *June 2*, 1763.

[Lord Egremont's visit was known to everybody. His coach had been seen at Lord Hardwicke's door, and it was generally supposed that negotiations for a new ministry were going on between them. The great object of the ministers was to divide the Whigs by jealousies, and especially to separate Pitt from them.—The affair of Wilkes was a very unfortunate one and might have that effect; but Pitt was showing great moderation, and even Lord Temple was well pleased with them all] and bid Onslow tell me that Mr Pitt is highly pleased with *the House of Yorke*, and as an

instance of it, he was the other day to make a visit to the Attorney General. Pray, says Lord Temple, tell this to the D. of N. (I should not say so much) but let this be improved, or to that purpose.

I presume the immediate occasion of this is the wise and manly part that the Attorney General has acted in refusing absolutely to move for such an information in the Court of King's Bench as must necessarily have brought the affair there, and would probably have occasioned much confusion and difference of opinion in the Courts of Westminster Hall, which must have been a most unhappy incident[1]. The meritorious behaviour of the Attorney General is universally known and does him great honour. By this means we shall hear no more of this disagreeable affair till the Parliament meets....

The administration...is certainly divided into two parts, the triumvirate viz. the two Secretaries and the great Mr Grenville on the one part, the supposed real favourites, my Lord Shelburne at the head, Lord Gower, Lord Sandwich (and it is supposed) the Duke of Bedford, Rigby etc. on the other, and this last, it is thought, has my Lord Bute's secret, and acts professedly under him and for him....I hear Mr Pitt, who is very cool and moderate in Wilkes's affair, and very prudently does not care to talk upon it but to leave it to the law is, however, very loud against the expulsion [from the House of Commons] before trial or condemnation, and he seems to me to be extremely in the right....Suggest to the Attorney the making a visit to Hayes.

Duke of Newcastle to the Attorney-General

[H. 81, f. 96; N. 264, f. 50.] CLAREMONT, *June 6th*, 1763.

DEAR SIR,

My affection and regard for you...makes me very impatient to acquaint you that Lord Temple passed all yesterday here. He is in *very good humour*, talks very reasonably, (enthusiastic as you know about Wilkes, but that will signify nothing) and he assures me, Mr Pitt is the best disposed imaginable.

Lord Temple's conversation dwelt yesterday almost entirely upon your subject, the great desire that he and Mr Pitt had to be thoroughly and most confidentially united with you, that their view was to shew their regard to you, which they should endeavour to do, at the same time that they had their good dispositions to my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, which it should be their endeavour to combine together, plainly hinting to me that what related to the Attorney General was *their first object*.—I might mistake him but thus it appeared to me.—

[1] The Attorney-General had filed an information for libel against Wilkes in the King's Bench, which was now, though not pressed, still depending (*Hist. of the Minority*, 168; below, p. 502). Wilkes was eventually convicted by Lord Mansfield of libel on February 17, 1764.

He told me with pleasure that you was to have an interview with Mr Pitt tomorrow, which Mr Pitt was very desirous of; and he begged that you would open yourself with the greatest freedom and confidence to Mr Pitt. Mr Pitt always had a *hankering after you*, and particularly ever since our last coming together.

He has also (whatever he may pretend) a most real and just regard and veneration for your Father. We all admit that nothing can be done without Mr Pitt. The way to bring that about in the rightest way for the public and ourselves is to have Mr Pitt have a confidence in our first and best friends. I know him perfectly well, and therefore I must entreat you to open your heart to him tomorrow; he will be pleased with it; his vanity will be flattered, and give him his due he is incapable of making an ill use of it.

I shall long to hear some account of your interview....I am, dear Sir,

ever yours

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 264, f. 52.] CLAREMONT, *June* 7, 1763.

...Lord Temple, who was here on Sunday, lay[s] great stress upon it and seems very hearty, *pretty* reasonable, but is set upon the most thorough union and confidence with the Attorney General; that is their great object at present....

Duke of Devonshire to the Attorney-General

[H. 82, f. 212.] [*June* 7, 1763.]

DEAR SIR,

As I feel myself much interested, both out of my friendship for you and the good of [the] Public, for the result of your conference this morning[1], I cannot forbear mentioning to you that I am of opinion that both Lord Hardwicke and yourself put a wrong construction upon what Mr Pitt said upon the contingency of the Great Seal becoming vacant. I do assure you that he did not intimate in the least to me, as if any bargain or agreement was to be made between you and my Lord Chief Justice Pratt in case of that event, but only talked at a distance of the mode of accommodating that business to the satisfaction of the person that should not be pitched upon by his Majesty for the Chancellorship. You will, I hope, excuse this trouble, and believe me to be with the greatest regard and esteem, dear Sir,

Your most faithful humble Servant,

DEVONSHIRE.

[1] With Pitt. See below, p. 506.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[H. 74, f. 255; N. 264, f. 56.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June 8th*, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,...

I do not wonder at the speculations which your Grace mentions to be flung out relating to any supposed intercourse between persons of different complexions in the present awkward situation; that the ministers, whoever they are, should wish to divide an opposition is a natural suggestion, and that the more violent should suspect the more moderate is as natural....They [the former] cannot digest the different manner wherein the affair of Mr Wilkes has been received and treated by us from what it has been by them, and that we have not gone as deep in avowing him and his cause, as they have done. This is what lies at the bottom, tho' my Lord Temple, having cooled a little, talks more calmly and endeavours to palliate. In doing this both his Lordship and Mr Pitt must see their own interest; for if they do not preserve their connexion with your Grace and your friends, they will be in danger of being left *as naked* as they owned themselves to be four or five months ago....Beardmore, who is the great support of *The Monitor*, and was very justly committed by the Court of King's Bench, when under-sheriff, for not doing the duty of his office in setting Dr Shebbeare in the pillory[1], is attorney for Wilkes and his click attends him. These are fellows who would have hanged your Grace and me a few years ago, and would do so still, had they the power. I don't mention this as thinking it ought to alter our conduct with regard to Lord Temple and Mr Pitt. I think quite otherwise; but to show that all the grounds of jealousy and want of confidence do not lie on one side, and that there are at least as material ones on the other.

Your Grace says, that "Mr Pitt is certainly, and was from the beginning, extremely moderate"; and I agree that he was much more *prudent* than the other. He avoided talking about the affair and did not suffer himself to fly out in conversation, at least with us. But your Grace did not find that the very wise and kind admonition, which the Duke of Cumberland gave him, appeared to have any effect. It is true that his brother-in-law had dipped himself very deep before, and we know that he has made it his rule not to separate himself from him, even where he does not approve. How far that rule may carry him I know not.

[1] See vol. ii. p. 63.

Indeed, my dear Lord, I cannot help looking upon this affair of Wilkes as big with very mischievous consequences, even suspended, as it now seems to be, till the next session, tho' of this last nobody can be sure; for the actions brought by Wilkes himself may keep the flame in activity till the circuits. But the mischievous consequences I mean are chiefly with regard to the part Mr Pitt may take. The Marquess of Rockingham was so good as to give me some account of what passed in conversation in his visit at Hayes, great part of which turned upon this subject. As I understood the Marquess the sum was this—"Mr Pitt declared his opinion very plainly that Wilkes was entitled to privilege. He doubted much whether the *North Briton*, relating to the King's Speech, is a libel, and whether the holding it to be so would not, in a high degree, infringe the liberty of the press as to censuring the transactions and advice of ministers. He said further that he could never depart from his opinion that the jury are judges of the law as well as fact." I lay more weight upon these declarations of his own than upon all my Lord Temple's loose and vague professions of thorough union etc. These are points of great consequence wherein, I believe, many of our friends will not follow him, and that may create a breach. My apprehension is that he will set himself up as a peremptory judge of constitutional law, as he did in the case of the *Habeas Corpus* Bill in 1758, when he laid it down as a maxim, *that the Lawyers are not to be regarded in questions of liberty*[1]. For my own part I did not give way to him then, nor will I do so now,—where in my judgment I differ from him. In political points I can show a deference for his opinion; but I will never act so mean a part as to give up all my knowledge and experience in the law, and all the principles about the legal prerogative of the Crown and public order and good government, which I have been endeavouring to support all my life, in complaisance to any man. When I speak of myself, I mean to include my friends in the House of Commons, for probably it may not come into the House of Lords; and yet I think I see more ways than one by which it may be brought thither; and if Mr Pitt should be overruled in the House of Commons, he may possibly do as in the former instance, bring in some bill to alter the law in some point or other....

I have heard nothing of any intention to push the expelling of him [Wilkes] out of the House of Commons. If that should be

[1] Above, p. 5.

attempted, they must certainly prove him to be either the author or publisher; and I have heard it affirmed (tho' I do not know it) that the Secretaries have the clearest proofs in their hands upon that point[1].

Now for your Grace's questions. The House of Commons may certainly enter into proofs and examine witnesses relating to the author or publisher of a libel, if they judge it proper for their notice; tho' their determination will not be conclusive to a court of common law. They did so in the case of Mr Asgill in 1707[2] and of Sir Richard Steele in 1713[3], and altho' in both those cases, the persons charged confessed themselves the authors, the House would have entered into the proofs if they had not confessed it, and in Asgill's case had actually taken and had them reported by a committee.

The case of Mist[4] in May 1720 is a very strong precedent. The House gave judgment and committed Mist to Newgate upon his name *as printer* appearing at the bottom of the paper, and then ordered an address of abhorrence to the King and a general committee to inquire of libels. But I enclose a copy of this proceeding from the Journal. As to proceeding to expulsion, there is certainly a particularity in this case, which did not occur in those others viz.: that the Crown has put it in a way of legal trial by information which is now depending. But it is to be considered that the King may, if he thinks fit, previously put an end to that information by *nolle prosequi*; or if not, and the House should determine Mr Wilkes to be entitled to privilege and he should refuse to waive it, then will arise a new consideration. Is justice absolutely to stand still in such a case? or shall the House proceed against their own member, who stops the Court of Justice below by insisting upon the privilege of that House?

But all these are merely the speculations of my own thoughts; for I assure your Grace, upon my honour, I have never heard one

[1] Wilkes was expelled January 19, 1764.

[2] John Asgill (1659–1738). M.P. for Bramber; author of an eccentric pamphlet containing doctrines contrary to Christianity, for which he was expelled the House of Commons; *Parl. Hist.* vi. 600.

[3] See above, p. 489.

[4] Nathaniel Mist, printer of the Jacobite *Mist's Journal*, imprisoned by the House of Commons, May 28, 1721, for libel in publishing reflections upon the King and the Duke of Marlborough—a strong instance of the powers of the Commons, since no violation of their privileges could be alleged as the ground of the commitment and the last case, according to Hallam, of this kind. *Const. Hist.* (1854), iii. 276; *Parl. Hist.* vii. 803. Also above, vol. i. 82.

word hinted about such proceedings. My meaning was only to answer your Grace's questions about the precedents. Nothing is more certain than that the House of Lords and the House of Commons both have originally entered into proofs about the authors and publishers of libels in many cases. Your Grace remembers the instances of Paul Whitehead for his poem *Manners, a Satyr*[1], and the *Constitutional Queries* upon the Duke of Cumberland[2], and there are many others....

I entirely agree with your Grace...concerning the impression made by the gross libels against Scotland, as a nation, upon our friends Lord Hopetoun and Lord President....I always thought that practice outrageous and abominable, and have writ such a letter as you advise for Sir Alexander [Gilmour] to carry to the President[3]....

I must beg for the future to be excused from writing such long letters, my eyes being grown so much weaker as not to be able to go thro' it....

P.S. I find I must punish my eyes still more. Since finishing my letter I called upon Charles, and found him at an early dinner in order to go to his diversion in Lincoln's Inn Hall. I interrupted him so far as to get from him a very brief account of what passed in yesterday's conference [with Pitt][4].

...Everything passed very amicably and well, and it may be all very sincere; but I own it smells a little of that holy water, which great men are apt to sprinkle when they have a mind to baptize others into their political faith. But this (as the news-writers say) time will discover. I own I fear that some part of what he said about Wilkes's affair gives too much countenance to the apprehensions expressed in my letter[5].

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 263; N. 264, f. 70.] CLAREMONT, *June 9th*, 1763.

[Lord Bute had returned, was, according to an anonymous informer of Lord Rockingham, displeased with the present administration, and wished to know whether the opposition would come in. Lord Rockingham had replied, and all were agreed, that Lord Bute was not the proper person to negotiate with or to incur obligations to, and the opposition could only go in as a whole with Pitt. The latter and Lord Temple laid the greatest stress upon a union with Charles] and, to talk their language, the House of Yorke is now

[1] Vol. i. p. 190. [2] Vol. ii. p. 44. [3] Below, p. 505. [4] Below, p. 506.
[5] These apprehensions were only too fully justified. See below, pp. 534 sqq.

their point....Lord Temple and Mr Pitt are set upon combining Lord Chief Justice Pratt and Mr Attorney General, together with, I think, giving visibly in that scheme the preference to the latter, which the world in general very justly does....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 264, f. 90.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June* 11, 1763.

...I know of no quarrel or breach that ever was between him [Charles] and my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, that should require a new coalition. Charles went on very harmoniously with him in office, and drew all his material reports for him. It is a very odd time for these gentlemen to think of pressing a more intimate and avowed union between them, but I shall leave that entirely to Charles's prudence, who knows him much better than I can pretend to do, because he has practised him....

Earl of Hardwicke to Robert Dundas, Lord President of the Court of Session

[H. 101, f. 350. *Arniston Mem.* (G. W. T. Omond), 174.]
GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June* 12, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,...

The scene is prodigiously changed since your Lordship saw us; indeed, it has changed several times. The actors who have gone off and come on you know, and in general the motives are no secret. I think none of the persons, whom you honoured with your friendship here, have been left upon the stage some time. As to myself, no great part could be taken from me, because I had none; but that seat, which I had been permitted to retain in the King's Council, I was excluded from just before the last Session of Parliament. When I said the motives of these alterations are no secret, I meant that the object of them must appear to everybody to have been the elevation and support of *one man's power*. A conduct too, in my apprehension, not necessary to that end, if it be considered from the time of our friend, the Duke of Newcastle's being forced out to this day; for a forcing out it undoubtedly was, and it was afterwards followed with a cruel and unheard of persecution of all his friends and dependants, especially in the inferior employments, altho' they had given no offence. Surely nothing was ever more unnecessary or unwise than to break that administration before a peace was made, which, I am convinced, might have been much better made and more to the public

satisfaction, had that administration been kept entire. And the consequence has been, according to present appearances (how real and sincere I will not pretend to answer for), the pulling down of *that power* which it was meant to build up.

Your Lordship has undoubtedly heard of me as an opposer. It is true that, in conjunction with several of your Lordship's and my old friends, I have opposed certain particular measures. When I have done so, it has been according to my judgment and conscience, with the greatest duty to the King, and a sincere zeal for his service and that of the public; and I am not ashamed of it. That great scene, the Parliament is over; but we are now got into a strange flame about an object, in himself of no great consequence, Mr Wilkes; and it has spread far and wide. I trust your Lordship will not believe that I have made myself a partizan in that cause. How far the particular paper for which he is prosecuted is a seditious libel, is by the Crown submitted to the law, and there it ought to be determined. I dare say your Lordship will not suspect me of countenancing any indecent treatment of the King, whom I honour and revere, and for whom my duty and affection are invariable; and that you will as little suspect me of approving any abuses or calumnies upon Scotland as a nation—a practice which I have always, in concurrence with my friends, disapproved and condemned. I have had the happiness of being acquainted with too many persons of worth and honour in Scotland to give an ear to such injurious reflections; and I hope I may appeal to my zealous endeavours, both in and out of employment, for extending the liberty and promoting the welfare of that country, as well as for improving the Union in general, as proofs that I am utterly incapable of giving countenance to anything that may tend to postpone and disappoint that great national end.

I don't say this from an apprehension that I stand in need of a justification to your Lordship. It would be doing injustice to our friendship to suppose it. But I have heard that attempts have been made to represent or insinuate me and my friends as enemies to Scotland, and was willing to enable you positively to contradict them....

I hope your Lordship enjoys perfect health. I need wish you no more; for I hear with the greatest pleasure how successfully and honourably you go on in discharging the functions of your high office, with an increase of applause in the public and of your own fame. On this head I can only say, *Fac ut facis*; and for the rest,

be assured that I continue to be, as you have always known me, my dear Lord,

Your Lordship's most faithful and most obedient humble servant,

... HARDWICKE.

Attorney-General to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 264, f. 124; H. 74, f. 259; H. 81, f. 102; H. 80, f. 67 rough draft.]

June 14th, 1763.

[Apologizes for his delay in writing occasioned by the multitude of his legal appointments, and proceeds.] He [Pitt] began by telling me that he had been for a considerable time desirous of a conversation, both to explain some things which related to himself and others which related to me. As to himself, he had been afraid that I might misunderstand (as others had done) words which once dropped from him in the House of Commons last year[1], as if he disavowed connections or engagements with that great body of the Whigs, whose incidental name only it was to be called the Duke of Newcastle's friends; that it was true he had disavowed the setting up one man for this office and another for that; but if ever he should have anything to say at Court (as he believed he should not), his principles were those of the Revolution; his party for the basis of an administration, the Whig party, to which the Tories and country gentlemen might accede, if they would accede to the principles; but he was not for an administration on a Tory bottom, to which particular Whigs might be invited; that with his Revolution principles and the Whig party he combined a strong desire to obtain satisfaction to those noble persons, who had been injured in themselves or their friends by the late violences, in a manner unworthy of their merit and services to the family on the throne; that in the confusion and animosity which he saw spreading, he was a friend to healing measures; that from appearances at Court and the preparations made in many great offices, he judged that some alterations would soon take place; that the present plan was to set the Duke of Bedford at the head which, in his opinion, would not do; for though his Grace's quality and consideration deserved all regard, yet, as a minister to conduct the King's affairs, he wanted the weight and confidence which that situation required. He did not mean that a majority would be wanting. Lord Bute had it and yet thought fit to retire.

As to myself, he spoke of our former friendship; that his opinion had been always the same; the distance which we had observed at different times was the consequence of political situations and nothing more; that he wished Westminster Hall on right foundations; it was everything in peace; that he knew

[1] Above, p. 371.

my merit and consideration (as he was pleased to call it) and the opinion of the world; that he supposed at Court the Great S[eal] was an object, which had sometimes been put in my view and sometimes in the view of others, just as they were in or out of humour with Lord H[ardwicke] and me; that if he should have anything to say and the King inclined to me, that it would have his approbation; that he wished at the same time so well to Lord Chief Justice Pratt (whom he commended), as that it might appear he acquiesced and approved; and that it would be of great utility to the public and an ease to my mind in every situation in Westminster Hall to know that he had that friendship and respect for me, and such a desire of union, as would discourage those at Court from setting up one against the other, and that (if I would trust him) he believed that he could bring that matter to bear.

[That he [Pitt] should give, or avow his opinion, that the King and the public would be well served by either of them, but his original acquaintance was with M[r] Attorney and it would be unbecoming in him, and he should be ashamed to attempt anything to his prejudice. He shadowed out by way of compliment that there might be some circumstances in his [i.e. Charles Yorke's] case that might make him fitter for such a high office than the other; that all he wished was, that when the event should happen, it might be so adjusted as to be with the satisfaction of my Lord Ch. J. Pratt and his friends[1].]

To the first part of this conversation your Grace will easily imagine that I concurred in opinion, and said everything which could show him my attachment to your Grace and the Duke of Devonshire and our friends; and that if the Court persisted in a plan inconsistent with our friends, that I knew very well what part my honour would dictate at such time as might be proper for me to choose. This was accompanied with expressing all the satisfaction possible in his union with you, which was essential to the whole.

To the second part, which related to myself, I said that I was extremely happy in the cordial and friendly manner with which he opened himself, and much obliged to him for it; what the King's inclination was appeared to me very uncertain, and possibly the office he had spoke of, to which I could not think myself equal, was intended neither for me nor Lord Chief Justice Pratt; that for Lord Ch. J. Pratt I had shown the greatest friendship and regard during my whole life; and whenever M[r] Pitt pleased, I was sure that it was in his power to make his friend do right, but that I thought my situation would be (what I liked best) that *of a private man.* [—M[r] P. "My dear Y[orke] [you] must be a public man—[2]."]

Other particulars passed, with which I do not trouble your Grace for want of time and because they are scarce fit for a

[1] Lord H.'s account, H. 74, f. 255; N. 264, f. 56.

[2] Rough draft, H. 80, f. 69.

letter[1]. He talked of Wilkes's affair, upon my saying it was unfortunate and might have political consequences. He thought otherwise, and treated it as Lord Temple did to your Grace. In a very handsome manner he said that he did not wish to put me upon talking of it, because it related to my office. [Mr Pitt then said that he owned it was an unfortunate affair, but he hoped not of so great consequence as some apprehended; that a great noise had been made about the part my Lord Temple had taken, but what did it amount to? He had visited Wilkes in the Tower and what then? Mr Wilkes a Buckinghamshire neighbour, an old acquaintance, in distress! That for his part he was most intimately united with my Lord Temple, and would never leave him; that he did not think the political consequence of this affair so important as some imagined; that he himself saw a *pour* and a *contre* in the argument [and] the debate of it, and it must take its course, or to that effect[2].]

Upon the whole, I can assure your Grace that nothing could please me more than the friendship of the whole manner in which he conversed for above an hour. The whole was *sub sigillo* of confidence, and as such I leave it with your Grace. I am, my Lord, with the greatest truth and respect, Your Grace's most faithful and obliged humble servant,

C. YORKE.

Excuse haste and the inaccuracy of this letter, which is folded up without being read over.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 264, f. 148.] CLAREMONT, *June* 16, 1763.

...The Princess [Amelia] desired me to tell the Duke [of Cumberland] yesterday that she had learnt that my Lord Bute... was always present for some time when the King made his visits to the Princess of Wales; that Lord Bute was sorry for having quitted, and that he intended to appear again avowedly as *minister*, whether in his old place or not, she could not say.....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 264, f. 162.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *June* 18, 1763.

...Lord Royston told me yesterday that Lord Bute comes frequently to his own house at Kew in a morning, and that the talk of the place is that he frequently sees the King there....

[1] The subject was probably the proposals made to Pitt by Lord Bute which he rejected, see p. 509.

[2] Lord H.'s account, H. 74, f. 260.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 275; N. 264, f. 240.] CLAREMONT, *June* 30, 1763.

...Mr Pitt mentioned [to Lord Lincoln] the proposals made to him by my Lord Bute, much in the same way that he had done to the Attorney-General, and that his answer was that he would never have anything to do with my Lord Bute; that he is now thoroughly connected with us, was determined to remain so and took all opportunities to do everything to bring us together, and particularly by the confidential conversation with the Attorney-General, that we might see that his regard for my Lord Chief Justice Pratt should be no obstruction to it; that he was ready to give the preference to the Attorney-General; that he wished at the same time that everything might be done with civility to my Lord Ch. J. Pratt....

Rev. Thos. Birch to Lord Royston

[H. 52, f. 77.] LONDON, *July* 9, 1763.

MY LORD,...

I was present, tho' in no advantageous situation for hearing, at that [trial] between Huckwell, one of Leach's men[1], and the messengers, in which the plaintiff had £300 with costs of suit allowed him by the jury, a select one of merchants. The whole weight of the defence of the messengers lay upon the Attorney and Solicitor-General, there being none of the King's serjeants to assist them except Whitaker, who only cross-examined a witness. The Counsel for the plaintiff were Serjeant Glynn[2], Mr Stowe, Mr Dunning[3]..., Mr Wallis and Mr Gardiner. The Court sat from between nine and ten in the morning till eight in the evening. The witnesses took up not much time, after which the Attorney-General began his defence of the messengers which he opened with an account of the course and tendency of the *North Briton*, exposing the licentiousness of that paper in the face of the author who was in Court, the enormity of the national invectives in it tending to a breach of the Union, and representing the grossness of the insult upon Majesty itself. Serjeant Glynn having highly exaggerated the treatment of the plaintiff and his brethren, Mr Attorney answered that if their treatment had really corresponded with the description of it, the duty of his office should not have engaged [him] to appear there that day, but that he was persuaded that the jury would distinguish between facts and words of aggravation. He entered largely into the power of Secretaries of State as exercised from the

[1] Dryden Leach, supposed, on information supplied to the government, to be the printer of the later numbers of the *North Briton*, including No. 45.

[2] John Glynn (1722–1799), Serjeant-at-Law; afterwards with Wilkes, M.P. for Middlesex, and Recorder of London.

[3] John Dunning (1731–1783), author of *An Inquiry into the Doctrines concerning Juries, Libels etc.* (1764); later Solicitor-General and 1st Baron Ashburton.

earliest times, and particularly by that very honest and able one, Walsingham[1], and urged that the defendants, having acted under the warrant of a legal authority, were liable to no punishment. In support of this two Acts of Parliament, made in the reign of King James I and one in that of the late King in favour of ministerial officers executing lawful warrants, were urged. The plaintiff's counsel having returned their answers to these pleas, the Attorney and Solicitor replied, and at last proposed to the Jury to bring in only a special verdict. The Lord Chief Justice having declared himself ready to give his judgment in the point of law, and the Jury expressing their desire to give a general verdict, after they should have heard his Lordship's opinion on that point, he proceeded to give it in a speech of above an hour and a half. He seemed clear that the Secretaries of State were not comprised in the three Acts mentioned, and that the messengers, having had no probable cause for apprehending Leach or his men, could not be justified by the warrant, however legal it might be, tho' he appeared to have some doubts of that, as it contained no name of person and was granted without an oath....When the Chief Justice had delivered his opinion on the question of law, the Attorney-General interposed with exceptions, which Mr Webb produced from his pocket ready drawn up; and these being admitted with the view, I presume, of having the point considered by the rest of the Judges, his Lordship recapitulated the evidence and charged the Jury to find the defendants guilty, leaving them to determine the damages. Before they went out Mr Stowe remarked to them that they should not bring in very small damages, as the arguing the exceptions would probably cost the plaintiff £200. Wilkes, on going through Guild Hall and all the way to the Kings Arms Tavern in Cornhill, where he dined with some of his friends, was received with the loudest acclamations, while the Solicitor-General, who had been very urgent on the Jury for a special verdict, was followed by hisses and would probably have been exposed to greater insults, if the Attorney-General had not taken him under his protection and carried him home in his chariot. The second of the fourteen trials came on the next morning, and being agreed by both sides to determine the rest, the Jury found £200 damages with costs....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 264, f. 296.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *July* 9, 1763.

...I have learnt very little relating to the trials. Some circumstances have an odd appearance till they are cleared up. My Lord Chief Justice at first expressed his doubts upon some of the points of law and his inclination to have a special verdict found, that they might be determined with the assistance of his brethren. This

[1] Sir Francis Walsingham, Queen Elizabeth's famous Secretary of State, 1573–90.

the Counsel for the defendant closed with and supported, but some of the Jury interposed and declared that they desired to find a *general verdict.* His Lordship gave way to the Jury; said they had a right to know his opinion in point of law in which he was in the right, provided he had formed one, and then went on to tell them that, as at present advised, he inclined to think so and so, whereupon the Jury found their general verdict for the plaintiffs. This goes a good way upon the principle of the Jury being judges of law as well as of fact, which, if it comes to be established, will have extraordinary consequences. He gave his opinion in this manner upon the first question, whether the defendants could be admitted to give evidence of a justification upon a plea of not guilty, and upon the third, relating to the manner of executing the warrant upon the plaintiff; but gave no opinion upon the second point of the *legality of the warrant.* I hear the ministry feel this stroke, but affect not to own that they do so....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 264, f. 349.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *July* 14, 1763.

...That third point, which concerned the manner of executing the warrants, did not arise from any orders or directions, given by the Secretaries of State, or any particular instances of oppression or hardship in the execution of them; for I have been assured that my Lord Chief Justice Pratt declared to the Jury that great gentleness had been used in the execution, and that no warrant could have been executed with less actual hardship. But the point turned upon this, that this general warrant is to apprehend *the author, printers and publishers of the libel therein described,* and as the persons taken up were not proved to be either the authors, printers or publishers of the *North Briton No.* 45, they were not any of the persons described in the warrant, and consequently there was no authority to apprehend them. The Counsel for the defendants insisted that the finding these persons in Leach's shop at work in printing other numbers of the *North Briton*, was *probable cause* for taking them up and ought to be so far allowed, at least in mitigation of the damages, but this was overruled by the Judge. From this, and certain other circumstances, I believe many cool-headed, impartial persons are inclined to think that, whatever there may be in the points of law, the damages are excessive; for I am told the detention was not above ten hours....

Earl of Kinnoull to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 264, f. 416.] DUPPLIN HOUSE, *July* 26, 1763.

...I am persuaded that my Lord Hardwicke will, as long as he lives, preserve inviolable that friendship, of which your Grace has had for a long course of years constant proofs. The high respect and veneration I have for his Lordship makes me truly lament his present situation, which must give him much disquiet and uneasiness, notwithstanding the uncommon serenity and calmness of his mind. His attachment to your Grace is invariable; his abilities shine with the same superiority, but his consideration, his weight and his figure cannot be the same when he is not followed by his family and his connections. Your Grace may certainly have the most sure dependence upon his most useful and sound advice, and I wish sincerely that it had been always followed upon material and important points. Your Grace knows how earnestly he endeavoured to dissuade the opposition in Parliament to the Address upon the Peace; tho' an opposition to so strong an approbation (and that too without lights and information) of Preliminaries, to which there were material objections and which were afterwards much altered and amended by the Definitive Treaty, was in itself perfectly justifiable; yet I must always be of opinion that it was an unwise and unfortunate measure and that it produced many unhappy consequences, which have had, and will have, great effects, and which are not compensated by the popular clamour of the citizens of London against the Peace....

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 392.] WIMPOLE, *Aug. 5th*, 1763.

DEAR ROYSTON,

...I desire you will acquaint his Lordship [Lord Lyttelton], that I have had two conferences with our friend, Lord Egremont, since he left London; the first on the evening of the great review day, at which you was present, and the latter on last Monday.... I would have you...tell him that I found in it many marks of that friendship, with which he is pleased to honour me. But the whole was very general, and the worst appearance was that there then seemed to be nearly as great an aversion to taking in the Duke of Newcastle, as to M^r^ Pitt and Lord Temple. I endeavoured to show the necessity of widening the bottom and letting in *several*; and for that purpose, and in order to alarm his fears, set in as strong a light as I could the great difficulties and dangers which hang over the heads of the *triumvirate*, as they are called; and the confusion and storms with which they will probably set out in the

meantime. This I did not fail to aggravate by the hollowness of their ground at Court. We parted with very civil professions on both sides, and from that night I have not seen Lord Egremont till last Monday morning.

I had writ thus far when your Keeper came in with your packets; and as I was just going to mount my horse, and unwilling to lose a fine hour, which is a great rarity at this time, I may be obliged to detain him a little the longer.

Having finished my ride, I resume my narration, which now becomes more material.—On Friday I was at the Levée, a very thin one, to make my bow to the King before going out of town for the autumn. His Majesty was very civil; enquired when I went to Wimpole, to which I answered, *on Monday*. I mention this circumstance, because I believe it brought upon me what follows. On Sunday noon I had a note from Lord Egremont to come to me either *immediately*, or *that night*, or on *Monday morning, as early as I pleased*. As I was just stepping into my chariot to dine at Highgate, I named either Sunday night or Monday morning, the last of which took place. His Lordship stayed with me about an hour and a half; began with great civilities and professions of regard, and then told me that he came *by His Majesty's order*, whose good opinion and esteem for me he avowed to represent in the royal words, which were such as it will not become me to repeat; that the King wished to see me again in his Council, and he was authorized by His Majesty to offer to place me *at the head of it*; that he (Lord E.) had taken occasion to lay before His Majesty at different times what had passed between us in former conversations; and that the King found that, after so long a friendship and connexion with the Duke of Newcastle, I had some difficulties, upon the point of private honour, to break through them; that tho' His Majesty had reason to be offended with his Grace's late conduct, yet, for the sake of attaining what he so much wished, if the Duke of Newcastle would accept one of the great offices about the Court, the King might condescend to it. That His Majesty understood the Duke had declared, in the House of Lords, that he would not come again into a ministerial place, and desired to know my opinion whether his Grace would return to the King's service upon the foot proposed. I own I did not expect so direct a proposition; and made all the dutiful, grateful but disabling speeches that became me; how little I wished to come into office again, I said, appeared by my having declined the

Great Seal in July 1757, and the Privy Seal in the winter 1761; which I had done with the greatest consideration for His Majesty's service; that as I had declined to accept an employment, tho' offered me, whilst all my friends were in Court, it was impossible for me to accept one whilst all my friends were out of Court; that as to what was said about the Duke of Newcastle, my connexion with him was avowed and well known; that I might have expressed myself shortly on former occasions, but I had always described or alluded to others also; that most of, if not all, the great Whig Lords, with whom and their families I had acted for forty years, were now displaced; and I should only tarnish my own character, at least in the opinion of the world, at the end of my life, and not be of any use to His Majesty, if I separated myself from them; that I rejoiced for the sake of His Majesty's service, that the proscription was so far taken off from the Duke of Newcastle; that I looked upon as a good beginning, but there were others besides his Grace. As to the point on which my opinion was asked, it was too delicate and important for any man to answer, without consulting the person concerned, upon that very point directly. Therefore I begged to know how far I might go with the Duke; for I would not exceed His Majesty's permission by one iota. My Lord answered that the King would by no means allow me to acquaint the Duke of Newcastle with this, unless I first declared my opinion that *it would do*. To this I said that I was then at a full stand. It was impossible for me to say now that it would do, and how should I know if I could not ask? If I was to hazard a conjecture, it would be that this alone would not do; that things had been suffered to go so far that his Grace himself must have formed connexions etc. However, it was repeated that I must not open one word of this to him. I could not help saying: "He will even know of this visit of your Lordship's to me; may I own that you have talked to me in the like style as formerly upon my own subject?" This was agreed to[1]. I then talked in general upon the state of the administration, and the storm they would probably set out with in Parliament; I found his Lordship very uneasy upon this head; and tho' he never named him, I know he is very jealous and uneasy with my Lord Shelburne; and some of Lord Egremont's friends seem to think that will have serious consequences....

He then spoke of the continuance of the cry against Lord Bute;

[1] He writes to the D. of N. accordingly, N. 265, f. 1.

that he had been hung up in effigy upon a gibbet, at one of the principal gates of Exeter, for this fortnight past, and nobody had dared cut the figure down in all that time. It is immaterial to run into the minutiae of our conversation; but in the course of it, my Lord had happened to say that the King could not bring himself to submit to take in a party in gross, as an opposition party. I told him nobody would advise His Majesty to avow the doing of that. But a King of England, at the head of a popular government, especially as of late the popular scale had grown heavier, would sometimes find it necessary to bend and ply a little; that it was not to be understood as being forced; but only submitting to the stronger reason, for the sake of himself and his government; that King William, hero as he was, had found himself obliged to this conduct; so had other princes before him; and so had His Majesty's grandfather, and found his government grow stronger by it; that I would venture to say to his Lordship privately that the right way was to advise the King to go roundly, and at once, to the root of the present evil; to make such arrangements and take in such persons, as might make his administration strong, and his government easy; that this would never be done unless three or four persons of confidence, some on one side and some on the other, were permitted to meet and deliberate; to put down in writing what arrangements the state of things might most conveniently admit, and what persons might be taken in, the whole to be submitted to His Majesty's consideration; that this was the method pursued in July 1757, and it succeeded; and His late Majesty's affairs never went on more prosperously than after that event.

I have now told you the substance of a long conversation. The only material thing besides was, that Lord Egremont at last varied a little the form of his restriction, as to the Duke of Newcastle, and put it finally, that I should not say anything to him of this proposition, till after I had seen or heard from his Lordship again; and so it was left. When either of those will happen I know not, for his Lordship knew I was fixed to go out of town the next morning for the autumn, and came to me upon that foundation.

As my Lord Lyttelton has a right to know from me all that passes upon this subject,...I desire you will acquaint him with the whole....But neither his Lordship nor you must mention one word of it to any other person in the world. If it transpires, the King will have reason to be angry with me....

'Tis high time I should conclude. I have tired myself and I

daresay you also before now....One of my greatest comforts will consist in the hopes of seeing you all here, as soon as your convenience will admit. I just now receive a letter from Mr John that I must not expect them till Monday at soonest. Here I am a vast species by myself alone, still revolving the changes and chances of things. But let them go as they will, I am always,

Dear Royston,

Most affectionately yours,

... HARDWICKE*.

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 265, f. 65.] CLAREMONT, *Aug.* 11, 1763

[Relates the substance of two very long conferences which he has had with Pitt whose jealousies had been again aroused, and who declared the impossibility of anything being done or of himself joining any administration, but who had been reassured by the Duke.]...

He then in a long conference of several hours with me only, let me into his jealousies, expectations and indeed *demands*, and it all centred in the conduct of the Yorke family, my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, and the great question about my Lord Chief Justice Pratt's opinion with relation to the point of privilege.

He said that he was a Whig, but for the substance of Whiggism, the Constitution and the liberty of the subject; that he knew what liberty was; that the liberty of the press was essentially concerned in this question; that he disapproved all these sort of papers, the *North Briton* etc.; but that that was not the question; but when the privileges of the Houses of Parliament should be denied in order to deter people from giving their opinions, the liberty of the press was taken away; that in this case the judgment given by my Lord Chief Justice Pratt was agreeable to the declarations of Parliament; that privilege did, and should, extend to all cases where security should, or ought to, be taken for the appearance of the person concerned; that in this case, though undoubtedly under that denomination, no security had been asked and consequently no security had been refused, but the person entitled to bail had been arbitrarily committed to prison; that such Whigs as would give up these points to humour the Court and to extend the power of the Crown to the diminution of the liberty of the subject, he should never call Whigs; that therefore, if my Lord Chief Justice Pratt should be run at for his late judgment or that that judgment should be attacked, he would never agree to it or act with anybody

* At this time my Father's health was such, that he had the prospect of a longer term than Providence allotted him; happy would it have been had he lived some years longer. But *Diis aliter visum*. H.

upon that foot. He talked most extravagantly as if he suspected a concert between my Lord Chancellor, my Lord Hardwicke, my Lord Mansfield, the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General, for that purpose.

I really treated that as one of the idlest of all suspicions, that those persons should unite almost in anything, especially in such a scheme; that as to particular opinions upon particular points of law, I could say nothing but that those points should be amicably talked over amongst friends.

He talked with great respect of my Lord Hardwicke, with great virulence and acrimony against my Lord Mansfield, and even preferred my Lord Chancellor's abilities to my Lord Mansfield's; commended his parts but said he was a very bad judge, proud, haughty to the Bar, hasty in his determinations and absolutely governed by Sir Fletcher Norton, in his court.

I can't say he spoke of the Attorney in the style he used to do, but extolled my Lord Chief Justice Pratt as the first and ablest man, either on the Bench at present or at the Bar; had superior talents in every respect; that my Lord Mansfield would not dare to open his mouth before him, and that he had got universal reputation and had established his character all over the Kingdom by his late behaviour; that he was the man for the support of the law and the Constitution, and that if he (M^r^ Pitt) could prevent it, my Lord Chief Justice Pratt should never be run down.

He then complained most heavily of the Attorney-General's behaviour. He said that from the value he had for my Lord Hardwicke and respect for the Attorney-General, he had had a long conference with the Attorney-General, that he then showed an inclination to accommodate the great affair of the Great Seal (which could not remain in the present hands) in favour of the Attorney-General, on other marks of distinction being showed to my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, whom he could never give up; but that M^r^ Attorney-General had received him so coldly and in such a manner, that he determined to have nothing more to do with it, and that he had told the Attorney-General so; that instead of receiving M^r^ Pitt's good intentions in the manner he ought, the Attorney-General had gone on in support of the measures of the Court, rather blaming and condemning the behaviour of my Lord Chief Justice Pratt upon the late occasion, and by that means making things wider than ever, instead of pursuing or showing any inclination to promote M^r^ Pitt's view of union and accommodation with my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, to which I find, by my Lord Temple, that my Lord Chief Justice Pratt had seemed very well disposed. This then being the case, he (M^r^ Pitt) had returned to his old friendship and predilection for my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, and must, if the case ever existed, give him the preference to the Attorney-General.

He flung out his suspicions that M^r^ Yorke stood off in order by his continuance in the King's service and the support of his measures,

he (Mr Yorke) might, when the case happened, have the preference given him, by the King, to my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, tho' Mr Pitt said that he was far from being clear that that would be the case; and that in his present situation my Lord Chief Justice Pratt would have infinitely the preference in the nation, and that if he (Mr Pitt) should ever have occasion to speak to the King upon the subject, he would tell His Majesty so. Nothing could be so strong or so violent upon this whole affair as Mr Pitt was. I lamented it extremely and did all I could to bring him back to his own former proposition of accommodating the affair between them, but to no purpose.

I told Mr Pitt upon what he said of the preference to be given by the King, that I did not apprehend that our consideration was which of the two would be preferred by His Majesty—that would entirely depend upon the person who had His Majesty's confidence. Our business was to form such a plan of administration as should be most for His Majesty's service.

I then told Mr Pitt that I was most heartily sorry to see him in this disposition, but as I had talked to him in the utmost confidence and freedom (as I had done), I must with the same sincerity, let him know that, as to myself, my long and most useful connection with my good friend, my Lord Hardwicke, for now upwards of forty years; the many obligations, public and private, which I had to him; the great support and most useful advice which I had always received from him with the most convincing proofs of the sincerest love, affection and friendship, with the Attorney-General's own merit, must make me, and should make me, prefer the Attorney-General for the Great Seal to any other person whatever.

Mr Pitt said that he did not in the least blame me, but what he had said related to himself only.

He once threw out the inferences, which had been drawn from my Lord Hardwicke's stay in town, and I think insinuated, as if we *all* might wish that my Lord Hardwicke might be in the way to receive propositions from the Court. I treated that as it deserved, and I really think upon that head convinced Mr Pitt, both with regard to my Lord Hardwicke and ourselves.

In short, I suppose I was principally meant. But to do him justice with regard to myself, he did not seem to entertain any suspicion, tho' I spoke as strongly to him of my inviolable attachment to my Lord Hardwicke as man could do.

Mr Pitt then entered further into his own grievances and his apprehensions of playing a solo with my Lord Temple. He said to me, "If I am so necessary, as you all tell me I am, why should there be any difficulty in giving me proper support in the formation of the ministry and council? If I am in this desperate situation to answer for everything, is it unnatural in me to desire, that the Great Seal may be put into the hands of a friend of mine, especially when that friend was Attorney-General and is now Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, which gives him the rank over everybody?

As to the Great Seal, I had before told him my resolution from which I could not depart. As to the other part of the ministry, I asked him if he had any friend of his particularly in view. He declined naming anybody, and I could not find by my Lord Temple afterwards that they had anybody....

Mr Pitt once flung out that, if the King had been convinced that his affairs could not go on in the hands they were and had therefore sent to Mr Pitt, he then might have been able to do some good and to do justice to us all and all our injured friends; but that that was not the case. I wonder he could even put that supposition. He once flung out, but that was the first day early in our conversation, that *he* would be of no council where *I* was not.

[However, Pitt had gone away in high good humour owing to a letter from the Duke of Cumberland to the Duke of Newcastle, in which H.R.H. expressed his pleasure at Pratt's conduct, as it was a mark of Pitt's steadiness to the cause.]

Aug. 18, 1763.

I now come to give your Grace an account of what has passed with the Attorney-General. He came hither on Tuesday, and stayed till yesterday noon. I thought it incumbent upon me out of sincerity and friendship to him not to conceal from him Mr Pitt's uneasiness at what had passed in their conference, and his strong declarations to me upon it....

The Attorney-General was at first extremely struck, mortified and provoked; and said that Mr Pitt had made a very unfair representation of what had passed between them, and appealed to his letter to me, giving me an account of it....

The Attorney-General said that Mr Pitt never said anything like putting an end to the affair, and as if he retracted all that he had proposed upon it, relating to the accommodating the disposal of the Great Seal in favour of the Attorney-General with the consent of my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, or (of which I have taken no notice in the former part of this letter) that his remaining in the office of Attorney-General was with the consent of your Grace and me—(as to myself I can say I never could be brought to approve it, however I might think it prudent not to push it); that Mr Pitt had never expressed to him any uneasiness at what had passed between them; that Mr Attorney-General had expressed himself extremely obliged to Mr Pitt for his great regard and civility to him; that therefore this great alteration in Mr Pitt must proceed from some new cause and alteration of system in Mr Pitt towards him; that it surprised and affected him very much, and that his part would be to remain a private man, which would be what was most agreeable to him.

I pressed him extremely to look forward, not to lay so much stress upon what Mr Pitt had flung out in warmth; that it would all come right, if Mr Pitt should finally determine to act a thorough part with us; that he saw how I took it with regard to him; that

I was sure your Grace and all our friends had the greatest value for him. Upon which he declared his thorough satisfaction and dependence upon and confidence in your Grace, and gave me some proofs of it, which indeed had not before come to my knowledge, and that he was determined to act up to what he had said to your Grace and me, with which he told me that Mr Pitt himself was satisfied.

The whole day passed in complaints of this sort, painting his own disagreeable situation, when Mr Pitt acted towards him in this manner, and was capable of making such an unfair unrepresentation of what had passed between them.

I was so much affected with his distress that I was extremely hurt with myself for having repeated to him what Mr Pitt had said to me, and Mr Attorney seemed to wish that I had not done it. But I daily see such misunderstanding upon what passes, and such a disposition to think that everybody will act as we would have them, that for one I am determined neither to flatter and deceive myself nor my friends.

The next morning I found Mr Attorney-General much cooler, after having reflected upon all that had really passed with Mr Pitt. Mr Attorney upon reflection said that, as to what Mr Pitt said that he had told the Attorney-General that he was determined to have nothing more to do with the accommodating the affair of the Great Seal, upon seeing what he had proposed so coldly received by Mr Attorney-General, which was what had provoked the Attorney-General the most, that he never understood Mr Pitt in that sense; that Mr Pitt did indeed fling out something that things were not ripe now, and that it could not be proceeded upon at present, which the Attorney-General admitted was on his showing a backwardness in the present conjuncture in coming to what might be called an open, professed accommodation with my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, or entering at present into new engagements or correspondence with him; that as to what Mr Pitt said, that your Grace and I had approved of his remaining for the present in his office, that he had acquainted Mr Pitt with what had passed with your Grace, to which the Attorney-General adhered—that your Grace seemed to approve it, and I also.

As to what passed with your Grace, I don't remember ever to have heard, till upon this occasion, any distinct account of it. The fact, as the Attorney-General relates it, was thus;—that he had entered more fully with your Grace as to his own situation than he had ever done with me, and particularly as to the circumstance of his office as Attorney-General; that if he was to resign that, the certain consequence would be, his being thrown on the other side of the Bar and people be introduced in his room, which would even distress those (meaning our party) who should happen to succeed; that he had therefore acquainted your Grace with his intention, which was to wait this summer to see whether this weak administration would continue and open the next session of Parliament, which he thought

impossible, or some other new scheme should be proposed, in which case he might be of more use to his friends, having the office of Attorney-General than if he was out of it; but that he had declared positively to your Grace that, if this ministry continued or any other was formed without the consent and approbation of your Grace, my Lord Hardwicke and myself, he knew what his honour required of him, and that he should then take his part and have no share in it; that with this your Grace seemed satisfied (and I think you was perfectly in the right of it), and he also thought that I was so too.

But what was most remarkable was that he protested to me that he had given this account to Mr Pitt; that Mr Pitt approved it, and thought that he was in the right in not resigning his employment at present.

I cannot but say that if this account, given by the Attorney-General, is literally true (as I have no reason to doubt it), Mr Pitt could have no cause for his suspicions. I endeavoured to soften Mr Attorney as much as I could, and told him that he must not be surprised; that warm genius's heightened sometimes their representations of what had passed, that that must be overlooked and that I was persuaded, if other things were right amongst us, this affair would soon pass over.

I think I have prevailed so far that the Attorney-General went away very reasonable, and will do nothing but what his friends, your Grace (who I find is the principal one)[1], my Lord Hardwicke and myself shall advise.

I must conclude this letter with begging, and indeed exhorting, your Grace to give serious attention to the contents of it, and to be persuaded that Mr Pitt's discourse to me was not a transitory one, and that, if he is not talked to in full confidence and has some explanation and satisfaction given him, upon the several points of grievance and suspicion, it is in vain to think of engaging Mr Pitt to take an active, confidential part with us[2]....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 265, f. 233.] CLAREMONT, *Aug.* 27, 1763.

...I had several long *têtes à têtes* with my Lord Hardwicke[3]; and I freely own to your Grace that *upon the whole* I am fully satisfied with them. I always make allowances for the nature and make of my best friends; and tho' perhaps I can't always approve everything, if upon the whole it is right, however peevish I may be at first, I am at last fully satisfied.

To be sure, the situation of my Lord Hardwicke's sons, and

[1] This evidently aroused a little the D. of N.'s jealous feelings. See also f. 166.

[2] See further on the same topic, f. 162.

[3] The Duke paid a visit to Wimpole about this time.

perhaps the inclination of one or even two of them, may not be just what I could wish. I am sure, upon the whole, my Lord Hardwicke is determined to do right, and so I verily believe is the Attorney-General....I acquainted Lord Hardwicke with the substance of what had passed with Mr Pitt. He was a good deal moved with it, and thought Mr Pitt's view was to tie up the Attorney-General to take no further step in the law but in concert with my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, and that his (the Attorney-General's) future fortune was to be clogged with my Lord Chief Justice Pratt. I found my Lord Hardwicke's aversion to my Lord Chief Justice Pratt was very great for the many slights and indignities which he had showed to him (my Lord Hardwicke) and to his son (the Attorney-General), and my Lord Hardwicke thought that Mr Pitt was bargaining and making such conditions beforehand as might tend to make him absolute master.

I softened everything as much as I could, and observed to my Lord Hardwicke that, considering the notion Mr Pitt had of the disposition and views of my Lord Mansfield and my Lord Chancellor, it was not extraordinary that he, by the union of my Lord Chief Justice Pratt and the Attorney-General, should be desirous of forming a strength in the law against them.

My Lord Hardwicke supposed (as I conclude is the case) that Mr Pitt's view was to make my Lord Chief Justice Pratt a peer, and to call him to the Cabinet Council, and said that, in this case, his son, tho' Chancellor, would pass his time very disagreeably, to have such a man as my Lord Chief Justice Pratt behind him, wishing him ill, and determined to take all the advantage he could of him.

I replied that the making a Lord Chief Justice peer was not a new case...and upon the whole I was glad to see that the chief objections were to the person of my Lord Chief Justice Pratt and to Mr Pitt for his partiality to him. I repeated the necessity of having Mr Pitt, if any success was to be hoped. He agreed and said,"And to a degree, I think so." Thus ended our first conversation.

My Lord Hardwicke is a very wise man and a very honest one; and tho', to be sure, this incident is not pleasant to him, he will not suffer it to make such an impression as may influence his conduct; and I am fully convinced that he will act in the utmost confidence in everything with your Grace and myself; and I only wish that your Grace would, upon all occasions, speak plainly your wish and opinion to him, and I am sure it would have its effect.

The next morning, riding out, Lord Hardwicke took an opportunity to renew the conversation with me and said, "I shall not talk to my son, the Attorney-General, in the manner I did last night to you upon the subject of Mr Pitt's conversation with you. I shall say to him only that I am not for his throwing himself at once into the arms of my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, and seeming to be in a hurry to be reconciled and strictly united to him; but I shall advise the Attorney to be approaching him, and by degrees

to seem to wish to be upon a good foot with him, but that in a way that should not have any glaring appearance, which would not be for the Attorney-General's honour."

I approved extremely this method; and indeed told my Lord Hardwicke that I thought the advice was extremely wise and all that could now be expected and, as I said before, my Lord Hardwicke is too wise a man to have gone this length, if he did not intend to go farther. If any proper or practicable scheme should be proposed to my friend, my Lord Hardwicke, if your Grace and all of us can bring M^r^ Pitt to be reasonable in other points, we shall not quarrel about the disposal of the Great Seal....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 325; N. 265, f. 251.]

CLAREMONT, *Aug. 28th*, 1763, past nine at night.

MY DEAREST LORD,

I write this at the request of M^r^ Pitt to desire that your Lordship would come to town upon business of the greatest importance[1]....My Lord Bute was with M^r^ Pitt three hours on Thursday last, and yesterday M^r^ Pitt was three hours with the King, and this day M^r^ Pitt was five hours here with me. M^r^ Pitt has made me promise not to write to your Lordship, to the Duke of Devonshire or anybody upon the subject of these conferences; I will only venture in general to tell you that M^r^ Pitt went to the bottom of the sore, both to my Lord Bute and the King, as well with regard to things and measures as persons. He was not ill received upon either, and at present it seems that the whole is flung into his hands. His declaration with regard to us, his friends, was very proper and very honourable[2]. Particular arrangements will be a work of future and, I hope, joint consideration; and, for that reason, I hope your Lordship will be so good as to be with us, for I shall come to no determination till I know your opinion.... I am, my dearest Lord, ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

...I wish I could explain myself further, but I dare not. M^r^ Pitt told both Lord Bute and the King that he must insist upon the Duke of Devonshire, my Lord Hardwicke and the Duke of Newcastle, and named many others afterwards.

[1] Above, p. 469.

[2] He refused to act with any minister who had shared in making the peace, or without the Dukes of Devonshire and Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke, "and the other great Lords and persons of consideration, who by themselves or their families had been the great friends of the Revolution and the principal supports of His Majesty's Royal Family now happily upon the Throne of these Kingdoms." N. 266, f. 302.

[He writes to Pitt on August 30 (N. 265, f. 288; *Chatham Corr.* ii. 239)] I could wish that you could contrive to see my Lord Hardwicke yourself alone, before either I or any of us see him. I know it would have a good effect; [and to the Attorney-General (N. 265, ff. 257, 261) that Pitt was received by the King] most graciously and most confidentially [and told that] he would consider all that he had said, and send for him again very soon.

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 265, f. 255.] WIMPOLE, *Aug.* 29, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,

I just now received the honour of your Grace's letter,... and am not so much surprised at the general subject of it as I am at the extent to which the affair has already gone. I said from the first that Lord Egremont's death was a *bridge* for the King to pass over without disgracing himself, if he pleased to make use of it, and am extremely rejoiced for the sake of His Majesty and the public that turn is now taken. Mr P[itt] was extremely in the right to go to the bottom of the sore with *both* the persons with whom he conferred. How far all our friends may like that the whole *seems* to be flung into his hands, I am not sure; but that may not continue so, and will in great measure depend on the use he shall make of it. *Ut tu fortunam, sic nos te, Celse, feremus*....I heartily wish that this measure thus begun may end for the tranquillity and happiness of this poor, divided country, and to the honour and satisfaction of my friends....

[On August 31 (N. 265, f. 302) Lord Hardwicke writes to the Duke of Newcastle from Grosvenor Square, where he has just arrived, only to find, however, that all was over, and annoyed at having been obliged to take the fatiguing journey for nothing.] What do they mean by committing the King in this manner, and involving so many persons of no small consideration?

[On September 2, 1763 (N. 265, f. 311) he received Lord Temple and visited Pitt, who gave him an account of the incident. Lord Hardwicke urged that at least the proscription against Lord Temple and Pitt had been removed, and that the negotiation might be renewed, but Pitt, as to the latter, thought the contrary.]

Earl of Hardwicke to Lord Royston

[H. 4, f. 415; partly printed in *Parl. Hist.* xv. 1327 and elsewhere.]

WIMPOLE, Sunday night, *Sept. 4th*, 1763.

DEAR ROYSTON,

At my return to this house last night, I found with great pleasure...your kind letter from Chatsworth....I saw the Master of Chatsworth in town, who appeared to be much pleased and flattered with your visit, and expressed great concern at being obliged to leave his house before you had finished your visit.

The Duke of Devonshire told me that he had acquainted you with as much as he then knew of the cause of his being summoned to London, and that you had all drunk to *bon succès* in a bumper. As it is the same for which I was called from my plough, I will give you the general outlines of it, and reserve the full narration of particulars till we meet. I have heard the whole from the Duke of Newcastle, and on Friday morning, *de source* from Mr Pitt. But if I was to attempt to relate in writing all that I have heard in two conversations of two hours each, the dotterels and wheatears would stink before I could finish my letter. Besides it is as strange as it is long, for I believe it is the most extraordinary transaction that ever happened in any Court in Europe, even in times as extraordinary as the present.

I will begin, as the affair has gone on *preposterously*, by telling you that it is all over for the present, and we are all come back *re infecta*. It began, as to the substance, by a message from my Lord Bute to Mr Pitt, at Hayes, through my Lord Mayor [Beckford], to give him the meeting *privately*, at some third place. This his Lordship (Lord B.) afterwards altered by a note from himself—saying that, as he loved to do things openly, he would come to Mr Pitt's house in Jermyn Street, in broad daylight. They met accordingly, and Lord Bute, after the first compliments, frankly acknowledged that this ministry could not go on, and that the King was convinced of it; and therefore he (Lord B.) desired that Mr Pitt would open himself frankly and at large, and tell him his ideas of things and persons with the utmost freedom. After much excuse and hanging back, Mr Pitt did so, with the utmost freedom indeed, tho' with civility. Here I must leave a long *blank*, to be filled up when I see you. Lord Bute heard with great attention and patience, entered into no defence, but at last said, "If these are your opinions, why should you not tell them to the King himself, who will not be

unwilling to hear you?"—"How can I, my Lord, presume to go to the King who am not of his Council, nor in his service, and have no pretence to ask an audience? The presumption would be too great."—"But suppose His Majesty should order you to attend him, I presume, Sir, you would not refuse it."—"*The King's command* would make it my duty, and I should certainly obey it." This was on last Thursday se'nnight. On the next day (Friday) Mr Pitt received from the King an open note unsealed, requiring him to attend His Majesty on Saturday noon, at the Queen's Palace, in the Park[1]. In obedience hereto, Mr Pitt went on Saturday at noon-day, thro' the Mall in his gouty chair, the boot of which (as he said himself) makes it as much known as if his name was writ upon it, to the Queen's Palace. He was immediately carried into the Closet, received very graciously, and His Majesty began in like manner as his *quondam* favourite had done, by ordering him to tell him his opinion of things and persons at large, and with the utmost freedom; and, I think, did in substance, make the like confession, that he thought his present ministers could not go on. The audience lasted three hours, and Mr Pitt went through the whole upon both heads more fully than he had done to Lord Bute, but with great complaisance and *douceur* to the King; and His Majesty gave him a very gracious *accueil*, and heard with great patience and attention; and Mr Pitt affirms that, in general, and upon the most material points, he appeared by his manner and many of his expressions to be convinced. But here I must again avail myself of my *long blank*, and only make one general description, that Mr Pitt went through the infirmities of the peace; the things necessary, and hitherto neglected, to improve and preserve it; the present state of the nation, both foreign and domestic; the great Whig families and persons which had been driven from His Majesty's Council and service, which it would be for his interest to restore. In doing this he repeated many names; upon which His Majesty told him,—there was pen, ink and paper, and he wished he would write them down. Mr Pitt humbly excused himself by saying,—that would be too much for him to take upon him, and he might upon his memory omit some material persons, which might be subject to imputation. The King still said he liked to hear him, and bid him go on; but said now and then that his honour must be consulted; to which Mr Pitt answered in a very courtly manner.

[1] Now Buckingham Palace.

His Majesty ordered him to come again on Monday, which he did, to the same place, in the same public manner.

Here comes in a parenthesis, that on Sunday Mr Pitt went to Claremont, and acquainted the Duke of Newcastle with the whole, fully persuaded, from the King's manner and behaviour, that the thing would do; and that on Monday the outlines of some new arrangement would be settled. This produced the messages to those Lords who were sent for; Mr Pitt undertook to write to the Duke of Devonshire and the Marquess of Rockingham, and the Duke of Newcastle to myself.

But behold the catastrophe of Monday. The King received him equally generously, and that audience lasted near two hours. The King began, that he had considered of what had been said, and talked still more strongly of his honour. His Majesty then mentioned Lord Halifax for the Treasury, still proceeding on the supposition of a change. To this Mr Pitt hesitated an objection, that certainly Lord Halifax ought to be considered, but he should not have thought of him for the Treasury; suppose His Majesty should think fit to give his Lordship the Paymaster's place? The King replied—"But, Mr Pitt, I had designed that for poor George Grenville; he is your near relation, and you once loved him."—To this the only answer made was a *low bow*. And now here comes *the bait*.—"Why," says His Majesty, "should not my Lord Temple have the Treasury? You could go on then very well."—"Sir, the person whom you shall think fit to honour with the chief conduct of your affairs cannot possibly go on without a Treasury connected with him. But that alone will do nothing. It cannot be carried on without the great families, who have supported the Revolution Government, and other great persons, of whose abilities and integrity the public has had experience, and who have weight and credit in the nation. I should only deceive your Majesty if I should leave you in an opinion that I could go on, or your Majesty make a solid administration upon any other foot."—"Well, Mr Pitt, I see (or I fear) this won't do. My honour is concerned, and I must support it."—*Et sic finita est fabula. Vos valete*; but I cannot, with a safe conscience add *plaudite*.

I have made my skeleton larger than I intended at first, and I hope you will understand it. Mr Pitt professes himself firmly persuaded that my Lord Bute was sincere at first, and that the King was in earnest the first day; but that on the intermediate

day, Sunday, some strong effort was made, which produced the alteration. Mr Pitt likewise affirms that, if he was examined upon oath, he could not pretend to say, upon what this negotiation broke off, whether upon any particular point, or upon the general complexion of the whole; but that, if the King shall assign any particular reason for it, he will never contradict it.

My story has been so long, tho' in truth a very short abridgment, that I shall not lengthen it by observations, but leave you to make your own. It will certainly be given out that the reason was the unreasonable extent of Mr Pitt's plan:—a general rout;—and the minority, after having complained so much of proscriptions, have endeavoured to proscribe the majority. I asked Mr Pitt the direct question, and he assured me, that, altho' he thought himself obliged to name a great many persons, for his own exculpation, yet he did not name above five or six for particular places. I must tell you that one of those was your humble servant, for the President's place. This was entirely without my authority or privity. But the King's answer was—"Why, Mr Pitt, it is vacant and ready for him, and he knows he may have it tomorrow, if he thinks fit." I conjectured that this was said with regard to what had passed with poor Lord Egremont, which made me think it necessary to tell Mr Pitt in general what had passed with that Lord (not owning that his Lordship had offered it directly in the King's name), and what I had answered; which he in his way much commended. This obliges me to desire that you will send me by the bearer my letter to you, which you were to communicate to my Lord Lyttelton, that I may see how I have stated it there, for I have no copy.

I shall now make you laugh, tho' some parts of what goes before make me melancholy—to see the King so committed, and His Majesty submitting to it, etc. But what I mean will make you laugh is, that the ministers are so stung with this admission that they cannot go on, (and what has passed on this occasion will certainly make them less able to go on); and with my Lord Bute's having thus carried them to market in his pocket, that they say Lord Bute has attempted to sacrifice them to his own fears and timidity, that they don't depend upon him, and will have nothing more to do with him; and I have been very credibly informed, that both Lord Halifax and George Grenville have declared that he is to go beyond sea, and reside for a twelvemonth or more. You know Cardinal Mazarin was twice exiled out of France, and

governed France as absolutely whilst he was absent, as when he was present.

... I am, as you know me,

Your most affectionate

HARDWICKE.

P.S. You will judge for yourself, that several things mentioned in this letter are fit to communicate to very few only....

When shall you think of Wimpole?

Lord Royston to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 4, f. 426.] WREST, *Sep. 5th*, 1763.

...I am glad your Lordship is returned well and in such good spirits from your fruitless journey, but there is so much of *comedy* in the affair that, tho' the consequences may be serious, one cannot help being diverted with several incidents of it. The poor King is terribly committed. Lord Bute has drawn upon himself the resentment of all sides; the most deplorable irresolution and weakness appears in the cabinet, and the most considerable men in the Kingdom have been fetched up from their retirements and sent back again, without a word of apology or explanation....

It seems a very extraordinary and very unhandsome behaviour that Lord Bute, having drawn M^r^ P[itt] into giving his free and full opinion of persons and things and having even insisted on his taking an audience of the King, should not let him know afterwards on what the negotiation had broke off, and indeed, why it was brought on at all till things were riper for it. I shall be able to contradict on very good authority the reports industriously spread about of M^r^ Pitt's extravagant demands and high behaviour. Surely matters will come round again before the Session opens, or great confusion must ensue....

Duke of Newcastle to the Attorney-General

[N. 266, f. 94.] CLAREMONT, *Sep.* 19, 1763.

...The formation of the new ministry, as well as the abrupt breaking off Mr Pitt's negotiation which seemed to him, after the first audience, almost as good as concluded, has surprised everybody....Lord Sandwich, if this holds, is or will be first minister; and will this nation submit to be governed by one of his character? or will those who pretend to have one serious thought for the good of this country, for decency or regard to anything that has the appearance of virtue, submit to it[1]?...

[1] The D. of N. writes to the Duke of Devonshire (N. 266, f. 154), "I wrote the part about Sandwich *high*, because I know their hatred of him and the fears they will be under for that great and grateful minister, my old friend, Sir Joseph Yorke." The Duke was unreasonably annoyed and disappointed at Sir Joseph's unwillingness to unite with

Attorney-General to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 266, f. 143.] *Sep.* 23, 1763.

...I am sure I need not tell your Grace, the new arrangements at Court have not unsettled my resolution, which is well understood. The only observation with which I shall trouble you on Lord Bute's treaty with Mr Pitt is this; that it appears to me the counterpart of the separate treaty which Lord Egremont would have opened through Lord Hardwicke, if it had been listened to; one was intended to detach you and your friends from Mr Pitt, the other was equally intended to detach Mr Pitt and his friends from you. It was imagined, I suppose, that either of these plans would have saved the greater part of the present system at Court....

[In reply the Duke writes, on September 25 (N. 266, f. 188)], Your letter is like yourself, full of great and noble sentiments, and in one word, believe me, *contains all that I could wish*; allow me once more to thank you for it; you have made me happy beyond what I can express, and I am sure it will be a cordial to the dear Duchess of Newcastle.

[On September 28, 1763 (N. 266, f. 192), the Duke of Newcastle gives an account of a long conversation which he had had at Hayes the day before with Mr Pitt. Pitt expressed an abhorrence of the Duke of Bedford and his conduct with whom, as well as with the other makers of the peace, he had told the King he would not serve in any government; repudiated the notion of any alliance between himself and Lord Bute as therefore ridiculous, and declared that Bute had been the person to break off the negotiation—for what reason he did not know—as he had been the one to begin it. When asked by the Duke of Newcastle, however, what plan should be followed that session,] Mr Pitt in his usual way desired to be excused; that his case was singular; that his health would not permit him to attend; that he was out of the question and could not determine what it might be proper for others, young men of quality and fortune, whose interest might be affected by it, to do in the present circumstances; that he never liked a plan of general opposition; that he should, as he did the last year, come to the House when his health permitted him and oppose what he thought was wrong...; that the subversion of the administration was not to be brought about by Parliament; that nothing could be done in the House of Commons; that in the House of Lords, indeed, if we could get any considerable strength there and add much to our numbers, that that was something; that might have an effect. ...I then said, "Why, then, Sir, would you have nothing done and

the opposition and resign his employment. Sir Joseph owed very little to the Duke of N. See above, pp. 24, 367 and 475. The fatal results of such appointments as that of Sandwich appeared at the outbreak of the war in 1778 in the scandalous state of the navy, over which he had for some years corruptly presided.

leave the administration to carry everything as they please?"—"God forbid, rather than that should happen, I would get out of my bed and come down to the House."

[In a letter to the Duke of Devonshire, of September 30 (f. 239), the Duke of Newcastle adds:] I forgot to mention that Mr Pitt talked with the highest respect and regard for my Lord Hardwicke, as absolutely necessary in administration from his weight, knowledge, experience, abilities and character. We had not one single word about the law.

[On October 1 (N. 266, f. 249), he sends Charles Yorke's letters.] They have given me great satisfaction as I daresay they will your Grace. Nothing seems now to be wanting but fixing the time for Mr Attorney General to resign his employment....The present time is in every respect the most proper.

[On October 3, 1763 (f. 265), the Duke of Newcastle sends accounts of further interviews with the Duke of Cumberland and Pitt.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 266, f. 311.] WIMPOLE, *Oct. 5th*, 1763.

...The great point seems to me to turn on the state of Mr Pitt's mind and his real intentions, and to me that great point seems to be one scene of chaos and confusion. I really cannot comprehend what his meaning and plan of conduct are, but I hope to be enlightened when we meet. I find your Grace thinks that the stories which are circulated by the Ministers as by relation, tho' not by direct authority, from the King concerning his conference in the Closet, have done him some hurt, and I really believe they have, whether true or false. I always feared that something of this nature would happen, and I own was surprised when I found on Tuesday at Newcastle House...that you were all full of such a strong approbation and applause of the conduct of that conference....

I own I cannot understand what is meant by the great concessions which Mr Pitt made to His Majesty of all the great and important employments....Mr Pitt did, as I remember, propose changes either specifically, or in general, for all or much the greater part of them. I cannot persuade myself that Mr Pitt is hurt in the opinion of the world by his concessions. Mr Pitt said very prudently that, if the King should think fit to assign any cause for the breaking off the negotiation, he would never contradict it. So far he was in the right; but that does not bind him

not to contradict any story which the ministers think fit to propagate. When he knows it to be false, he might say that he is sure the King would never say it. His R.H.'s plan of an administration[1]...is, as you truly call it, "a great and noble one," but in my humble opinion can never be carried into execution by treaty or negotiation of any kind. By a constant vigorous opposition, uniformly pursued with great strength it may, provided it proves successful, but that is the only measure for such a plan. Whether there are forces sufficient for this, in this House of Commons, I am no competent judge.

I entirely agree with the Duke of Cumberland and your Grace that Mr Pitt has certain managements for my Lord Bute. What may be the source of them I cannot pretend to judge; for I am convinced we don't know the whole of what has passed between them, especially in the beginnings of the late negotiation. I don't say this by way of blaming it. In such cases everything cannot be told. It appears also that there have been *pourparlers* by a third hand, between the Duke of Bedford and him [Pitt], which were never disclosed till now[2].

Your Grace says very truly that there is a necessity of duly considering what in these circumstances should be done, and what part the most material persons will take. That is the great question, and nobody can answer it in the first place but Mr Pitt. Everybody has in effect concurred to throw everything into his hands....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 266, f. 331.] CLAREMONT, *Oct.* 6, 1763.

[He is much disappointed that the Duke of Cumberland is not coming to town to meet Pitt.] I have received a very extraordinary and uncomfortable letter from my Lord Hardwicke, pleased with nobody and with nothing; full of jealousies and condemnation of Mr Pitt and of cavils upon every word that has passed in my interview with him. This forebodes very bad for your friend, the Attorney-General. But one thing I am determined to insist upon, that my Lord Hardwicke and his family shall speak out, and so I shall tell them in plain words. [He is weary of his present disagreeable situation and must know of whom the opposition is going to consist. Why has not Lord Rockingham

[1] *I.e.* one composed of the Whig leaders with Pitt and Lord Temple, and without any connection with Lord Bute (f. 105).

[2] *Bedford Corr.* iii. 236.

come up? If they shall all agree that nothing is to be done, he will acquiesce and rejoice at it. But they must give their opinions. He fears the Duke is angry with him.

On October 7, 1763 (N. 266, f. 340; Chatham MSS. 51), the Duke of Newcastle writes to Pitt desiring his presence in town to meet the Whig Lords and the Duke of Cumberland. The same day (N. 266, f. 342) Pitt writes to Newcastle in a very bad humour, expressing the] sad repetition of my final despondency after what has happened as to the possibility of restoring the affairs of a country, shamefully sacrificed and weakly cooperating with its own undoing....

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[N. 266, f. 405.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Oct.* 12, 1763.

[On the whole he is satisfied with his recent interview with Pitt.] He gave a natural account of what passed about my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, as recommending him to supply the place of my Lord Mansfield at Council, when my Lord Hardwicke could not be there. He was more reasonable about the Attorney than he had been, and now rested everything upon what he called *constitutional points* and real Whig principles. He exclaimed against Wilkes and the *North Briton* more than any man I ever heard[1].

Attorney-General to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 266, f. 401; H. 81, f. 62.] *Oct.* 13, 1763.

MY LORD,

I think it my duty to acquaint your Grace that I made the visit proposed last night. The detail of what passed in some articles I reserve for your Grace at another time. The manner was very civil, tho' some disagreeable things were thrown in. I opened to him my desire on what your Grace and the Duke of Devonshire had intimated *that he was not satisfied*, to explain myself, if anything was wanting, and that it was matter of real concern to me not to have given satisfaction where I had received so much. In the *public* part I scarce supposed that he had objections to my way of thinking, and I went thro' it. In the *private* part, with regard to *himself*, I said everything which I could say with truth and honour of my constant inclination towards him; and with regard *to his friend* [Lord Chief Justice Pratt], I spoke of the personal kindness I had so frequently shown him, my uniform desire to live in good correspondence, and that I had only meant to leave the time and manner of it in those hands, where it might be trusted; that I was much concerned at the difference of opinion, which was very unfortunate in this moment of time; but if the occasion of debate arose, as it

[1] Further, ff. 395, 397.

probably would, that I should do it in a respectful manner to the Court of Common Pleas, and as if I had sat there and differed as a judge. He professed himself quite satisfied in the personal part both as to himself and his friend, but declared that he had hoped to unite us on the point of privilege, a *constitutional point* etc: etc:, but finding it impossible from what the Duke of Devonshire and myself had dropped of my opinion, and that my opinion precluded me, he could only regret etc: etc: and that he must take his part, in which he was very clear. After much on this subject, I raised conversation on the session of Parliament and the finances, colonies and foreign affairs. He seemed to think that little could arise on the first day of the session; a general Speech, and general Address; that he should attend on the matter of privilege; and when that was over, he had done; he should go into the country, where he must live as being necessary for his health, and he would come afterwards only on occasions of the first magnitude as he had done last year (disclaiming an opposition like Lord Bath's)....

Upon the whole, my visit gave me a good deal of light and information, and your Grace observes that he avoided dropping things to me in the style of the conversation in June last....

Right Hon. William Pitt to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 266, f. 413.] JERMYN STREET, *Oct.* 14, 1763.

MY LORD,

After our long conversation the day I had the honour to dine with you at Claremont, your Grace will easily judge of my disappointment and concern to find that Mr Attorney General, far from being open to meet upon one common ground in maintaining the privilege of Parliament, in case that matter should come to be agitated in the House, had from *the beginning* given a direct and full opinion against it, in the case now in question. I have little to say on this unhappy business farther than that I could wish I had been told the full state of the thing sooner[1], that I might not have proceeded in the vain dream that some solid union upon real revolution principles and an assertion in earnest of the freedom of the Constitution, in so sacred an article as privilege of Parliament, was indeed practicable. Under the various byasses, managements and entanglements which draw various ways, this state of discordancy, which now comes out, is not, however, much to be wondered at; for how after all could a lingering on in a Court situation under a rash and odious ministry be brought to square with the public views of those, who openly resisted the dangerous power of it[2]? The fatal consequences of this inevitable disunion are too obvious to admit of much observation. All I will say is that my resistance

[1] This ignorance on a topic of public discussion was obviously a pretence. See pp. 508, 536, 538, 542.

[2] Pitt himself could certainly not be reckoned among these, if there were any.

of Lord Mansfield's influence is not made in animosity to the man but in opposition to his principles: if his ways of thinking are to prevail in Westminster Hall, it is indifferent to me whether his Lordship's name or any other is to sound the highest amongst the Long Robe. Your Grace knows too well how far I carried my despondency to be able to do anything material for the public good; this last *éclaircissement* has given the finishing stroke, as it obliges me to bid adieu to all hope of seeing M^r^ Attorney-General upon one ground with me and my friends, in the notions of liberty and of the great landmarks of the Constitution. I should do M^r^ Yorke great injustice, if I did not acknowledge all the obliging and kind expressions which he had the goodness to employ on my personal subject, as well as what he was pleased to say with regard to my friend, Lord Chief Justice Pratt....I am with perfect respect,

Your Grace's most obedient and affectionate humble servant,

W. PITT.

If the Duke of Devonshire had been within my reach, I should have troubled his Grace with a letter upon this interesting subject.

[The Duke of Newcastle replies the same day (N. 266, f. 415). He had known of the difference of opinion, which gave him great concern, but had hoped, if there were agreement on other points, this also might be arranged. He laments the fatal consequences, but has done all in his power, and will continue to do everything, to prevent them.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 266, f. 428.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Oct.* 15, 1763.

[Describes a serious attack of illness and proceeds] I am sorry to find that M^r^ Pitt talked to your Grace with some *abatements*[1] of what he had said to the Duke of Devonshire. But I find he always does so. On Wednesday night the Attorney-General had a conversation with him of two hours. Everything passed with great civility and appearance of cordiality; and everything that was misunderstood before was explained. But he made it plain that the principal part of what he had aimed at with regard to Charles, was an unreasonable, impracticable thing. What he means by Charles's entering into a thorough correspondence and connexion with my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, was explained to be that Charles should concur in avowing and supporting Pratt's opinion, upon the point of Wilkes's privilege in the House of Commons. Charles could only answer that, if he should be convinced in his judgment

[1] The D. of N.'s expression (f. 405).

that *that opinion* was right (which he was not yet), he should certainly agree with it, and if he should not, he should differ from my Lord Chief Justice with the same decency and respect as if he had sat with him as a puisne judge of the Common Pleas. But after having given an opinion in general to the King as his Attorney-General, he should be the last of men, if he acted any other part, unless he should be convinced in his judgment that it was wrong. To which Mr Pitt replied that he saw he was precluded. By all that I could observe from the relation Mr Pitt, who in his first conversation treated the affair of Wilkes slightly, and as what would little affect public affairs, makes it now his principal point; and this is all he has meant when he has talked of Charles's uniting with my Lord Chief Justice Pratt upon constitutional points,—Magna Charta—and Revolution doctrines; as if the differing in opinion upon a question of privilege of the House of Commons, never yet determined by that House itself and which Mr Onslow himself declares still to be very doubtful, was of the essence of Magna Charta and of the liberty established at the Revolution....I was amazed to read the account which your Grace gives of the offence Mr Pitt has taken at my Lord Mansfield's concurrence in the election at the Charter House. Was ever the assistance of anybody's vote rejected in an election?...The like may be said of his finding fault with your Grace's and the Duke of Devonshire's receiving him in a visit....Is it the rule that because people differ from one another in politics, therefore all civil intercourse must be cut off? Upon my word, great and able as he is, if he goes on in this way, he will be thought to give too much countenance to what the King was once reported to have flung out —"What do they mean? Do they mean to put a tyrant over me and themselves too?" I mention these things because I am sorry for them, as thinking they will have ugly consequences....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 267, f. 1.] CLAREMONT, *Oct.* 16, 1763.

[Sends accounts of his interview with Pitt and the foregoing correspondence.]...I am afraid from the whole tenor of Mr Pitt's letter that there is nothing to be expected from him, and that this incident with Mr Attorney-General has determined him to speak out, tho' he avoided it before....

I am sorry to say that in my opinion they are both glad of this pretence for not coming together, and the Attorney-General may

think that, if he stands out and does not offend the Court, whenever a change shall happen, he shall have a preference with the King for the Great Seal; and Mr Pitt may hope that, if the Attorney quits his office and takes a thorough part, even in what relates to the proceedings against Wilkes, that then my Lord Chief Justice Pratt will have the advantage over him; for Mr Pitt told me very remarkably that there was never a moment since the King came to the Crown when he would not have preferred my Lord Chief Justice Pratt to Mr Yorke[1].

[Pitt still professed his ignorance of the cause that had led to the breaking off of the negotiations with the King, but said]—"If the King was really pleased with me, would he have suffered these false misrepresentations to be made, and that by authority, of what passed in my audiences?"—and he dwelt long, as he had often done before, upon his not having heard anything from my Lord Bute since....

I told him that the King had sent word to the Attorney-General that Mr Pitt had proposed to His Majesty to make my Lord Chief Justice Pratt immediately a peer, and to call him to the Cabinet Council, and that, if Mr Attorney-General would continue in his office at present, His Majesty would make him (the Attorney-General) a peer, whenever he went out of it.

Mr Pitt said that was true, that he did tell the King that, as he (Mr Pitt) was determined not to act with my Lord Mansfield in council, it would be necessary, especially at this time, to have some considerable man of the law to be of the Council, to be constantly there when my Lord Hardwicke's age, or any other cause, might prevent him from attending, and that therefore he had proposed to His Majesty the making my Lord Chief Justice Pratt a peer and calling him to the Cabinet Council, and that was done without any offence to the Attorney-General.

He persisted in his opinion that whether the King made my Lord Chief Justice Pratt or Mr Attorney-General Chancellor, he should always say that His Majesty had made a very good one; that as my Lord Chief Justice Pratt was his friend and had now the *pas* or precedence of the other, Mr Pitt must be preferably for his friend; but that he would have my Lord Chief Justice Pratt in the House of Lords in all events to speak for him (Mr Pitt) against my Lord Mansfield, and that wherever my Lord Chief Justice Pratt was, my Lord Mansfield knew he had his superior. That I much doubt....

[Pitt had censured most unreasonably Lord Rockingham for accepting Lord Mansfield's vote for the Charterhouse, and himself for receiving him at his house. Nevertheless they had parted in good humour, Pitt] saying smilingly—"Well, we shall differ when we come to my country gentlemen; I shall be for more of them than you will like."—To which I answered smilingly also, "I will be for confining you to as few as I can."

[1] For the accuracy of this statement, cf. p. 367.

[He sends the Duke of Devonshire several letters of former date from Lord Hardwicke and the Attorney-General, giving accounts of Charles Yorke's two interviews with Pitt.] By all which, I think, it is clear that Mr Pitt had been sufficiently apprised of Mr Attorney-General's opinion and intention relating to the point of privilege and the other points relating to the affair of Wilkes; and indeed, how is it possible for a man of any credit and reputation to do otherwise but to adhere to an opinion he had given, except he is convinced in reason that that opinion is wrong[1]? Mr Legge says, if the Attorney-General was capable of contradicting himself in such a manner, he would not be worth our having[2]....

[On Oct. 16, 1763 (N. 267, f. 19), the Duke of Newcastle writes to Lord Hardwicke on the same topic of the unfortunate difference between Pitt and Charles Yorke, repeating Pitt's complaints, and expressions of despair*.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 267, f. 21.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Oct.* 16, 1763.

...As to the last conference between Mr Pitt and the Attorney-General, the more I read of it, the more I am astonished at the manner in which Mr Pitt takes it and the way in which he treats it. What Charles then told him is exactly agreeable to what he has all along said to us all upon that subject. Could he possibly leave it upon a fairer or more honourable foot? I mean that of *being convinced in his judgment or not.* Supp[osing] he was to quit his Attorney-General's gown tomorrow, could he possibly act so base a part as, when Wilkes's question came on in the House of Commons, to act contrary to the opinion which he had given the King when in office, unless he was convinced that opinion was wrong? This is what I have always said to your Grace as for myself, and I must beg that you would for once look back to my letter to you of the 8th of June last[3], wherein this whole matter is fully stated and all the parts gone into; no expectation given of the contrary, and your Grace acquiesced in it. You will find also,

[1] See above, pp. 535-6.

[2] Further, D. of N. to Lord Rockingham on the same, N. 267, f. 23, and to the D. of D., f. 40.

* September 23, [17]74. N.B. This was one of Mr Pitt's *querelles d'Allemagne*, for he certainly knew what the Attorney-General's and my Father's sentiments were on the affair of privilege before—and in a conversation with my brother in the summer plainly avoided the discussion of it to prevent jarring. In short, our whole conduct was so unable and turned out so ill, that I am determined never to read these letters over again. H. (H. 74, f. 348.)

[3] Above, pp. 501, 503.

towards the end of that letter, that Mr Pitt himself, upon what Charles then said to him, did also acquiesce and treated Wilkes's affair slightly, whereas he now seems to your Grace to lay his whole stress upon it. My son will never submit to act such a part, unless convinced in his judgment; and if he could possibly incline to it, I would be the person to advise him against it. He would lose all character for ever....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 267, f. 51.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Oct.* 21, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,

I had this morning a very disagreeable visit from the Attorney-General, which surprised me extremely after what passed last night. He began by telling me that he had taken his resolution, but that he found that, when he put that in execution, everything was over with him, and that he must have done with his public expectations, or to that purpose. I endeavoured to convince him of the contrary but to no purpose.

He then told me that your Grace had very kindly spoke to him last night that the secret should be inviolably kept out of regard to the King, and that nobody should know it till he had apprised His Majesty of it, and that therefore he came to me to press the keeping of the secret.

I own it hurt me cruelly that Mr Attorney should think that I wanted such a caution[1].

It hurt me also that he should talk in such a way as he did upon a resolution which he had taken so much, as I thought, for his own honour, and I did express myself perhaps too warmly upon it; and I was sorry your Grace should give him that caution with regard to the King; indeed he did not want it. He said also that as to the *manner* and *time*, that must be left to him, from whence I did, and do, apprehend delays which must take off the merit of what he intends to do. As I am his sincere friend, notwithstanding all this, I could not avoid advising him to do what he intended to do soon; that delays could only hurt him. In short, I am afraid he will kick down the merit by the awkward manner of doing it, and that is always the case when people act *contre cœur*....

If the Attorney-General quits immediately, that will have more effect than all that we can say. I find to my sorrow and surprise that I have lost my credit with him. I am sure I don't deserve it of him, I can't bear jealousy when my heart is so clear as mine is towards him, but I am unfortunate in more cases than in this, but none so unjustly....Nothing but Mr Pitt's acting a clear part and

[1] As appears from the Duke's correspondence (f. 81) he proceeded immediately to give hints of Charles Yorke's intention.

the Attorney-General's quitting can raise the spirits of our friends. I suppose you will see the Attorney-General some time this day. I have no objection to your telling him what I write to your Grace. I am sure I meant it with great friendship and affection towards him.

I am to be saddled and charged with everything that is disagreeable to him. The Attorney-General told me that Mr Pitt was quite gone, and that it was I that had brought him up again, and set him where he now is. This is my original sin. Your Grace knows that in that I acted with your Grace (as I always shall do) and the rest of my friends. All that I can say is that your Grace is more lucky than I.

When the Attorney-General told me that it was over with him, I endeavoured to prove the contrary by repeating to him the assurances which your Grace, my Lord Rockingham and myself gave him the last night, that upon all occasions we should and *would* prefer him to any body in his profession. He seemed very much obliged to us, but thought that Mr Pitt would be inflexible and that we should not be able to overrule him.

These disagreeable incidents from all quarters give me great uneasiness. Last night I was fully recompensed for Mr Pitt's awkwardness by the noble and honest part the Attorney-General had taken. This morning I find some *ifs* and *ands*, and such an unwillingness to do what I thought last night he intended with ease, cheerfulness and satisfaction, that I doubt it will end awkwardly at last....Don't be angry with me (tho' I am sure you will) for these disagreeable letters. Any unkindness from the House of Yorke, and especially from the Attorney-General, goes to my heart. I vent all my uneasiness to your Grace; the reason is because I think you my best friend, tho' I am now and then vexed with you as I was for your caution to Mr Yorke about the King. Pray communicate everything to the Duke [of Cumberland]. I hope he will advise us what to do. Ever yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

...Let me have one line from your Grace, if it be only to let me know that you are not angry with me. I am so made, I cannot help discovering my uneasiness when I think my friends, such as the Attorney-General, suspect me....

[The Duke of Devonshire replies on October 21, 1763 (N. 267, f. 56). He regrets that anything disagreeable has happened, but the Duke of Newcastle] must make allowances for him [the Attorney-General] and consider that the step he is going to take is of great consequence to him and, as he has expressed it, it is a very great stake....

Duke of Newcastle to the Attorney-General

[N. 267, f. 88; H. 81, f. 127.] CLAREMONT, *Oct.* 26, 1763.

DEAR SIR,

I must begin with that which gives me the greatest joy and satisfaction, I mean most sincerely to congratulate you upon what I hope I may call my old and great friend, my Lord Hardwicke's perfect recovery....

I have several times determined to write to you upon what passed on Friday morning last at Newcastle House. I really did not know what to say, but I choose rather to say anything than to be totally silent. Upon reflection I am extremely concerned at an improper warmth which I expressed at the apprehension of being suspected by you, either for want of the most ardent zeal for your service or of not giving due attention to observe that secrecy, which in the present situation was so necessary upon a point which so essentially concerned you, and it might proceed from an uneasiness that a preference to others in what related to yourself had before given me.

I don't imagine you can think that any one man in all England, except your own family, can have so much concern for you, your honour and figure in the world, as I *most undoubtedly* have; but I did and do fear that you think my zeal for other objects may, for a time, get the better and make me less attentive to your own particular interests, and that I may have as good inclination, but not so much discretion and prudence as others. In that you are extremely mistaken; I hope whatever my wishes may be for the public, they will never make me forget my duty and gratitude to my friends; but I look upon it as part of my duty to my friends to tell them honestly and freely my opinion when I am consulted by them. I know and feel as well as any friend you have, the great sacrifice you make. I honour and value you for it; but if you will please to remember, I have never once given advice upon the question *an*; that I always wished might be left, as it ought to be, to yourself, and to yourself *only*; we ought not to interfere in that. As to the *quomodo*, I don't think that quite the same. When once a friend takes a great resolution for himself, it may not be impertinent for his best friends, to give him their thoughts upon that for his consideration but not direction. The town is in some measure full of this question, not from me, for I have scarce seen anybody.

The Solicitor-General has been sent for up, and a good friend of yours told me, "he knew it was to be so"; and therefore out of duty and regard to the King, I think with the Duke of Devonshire His Majesty should be acquainted with it before it comes to be known with any sort of certainty. But I still return to my own uneasiness, that I was not the person who should have been suspected of such a very childish and indiscreet behaviour.

I did think, I do think, that Mr Pitt has been to blame in the greatest part of his behaviour to you, and totally so in this last affair, and that I have publicly declared and under *my hand* to your two great friends, the Duke of Devonshire and my Lord Rockingham, and I have reason to think that Mr Pitt himself knows it; and this justice Mr Pitt always does me, to declare his knowledge of my partiality to you and he does not, or did not, blame me for it.

I own I have wished from your own account, and not his, that you had show'd more disposition to something like an accommodation with my Lord Chief Justice Pratt, and to Mr Pitt's hints or proposals to you, than you seem to have done in that conversation. Many things, I think, would have been avoided which have since happened; and I believe I am not the only one of your best friends who am of that opinion.

When I found that I could not bring Mr Pitt back, I thought the only thing I could do for your service and to show my unalterable attachment to you, was to declare to him in express words,—"Sir, it may not be in my power to be of any service to anybody, but I must declare to you that, if ever it is, I must, out of personal regard to the Attorney-General, his merit and consideration, as well as to the long valuable and most intimate friendship which I have had with his Father, prefer the Attorney-General to all the rest of the world[1]." This I did to leave no room with Mr Pitt to think that he could possibly be able to talk me out of it. And to do Mr Pitt justice, he seemed to think that I was in the right. As to convincing him, I found that impossible, and that I left to others, equally (I know) willing with myself and much more able.

Upon the last question I have fortified the Duke of Devonshire, my Lord Rockingham and even the Duke of Cumberland with proofs how much Mr Pitt is to blame upon that point, by communicating to them the accounts, which you yourself and my Lord Hardwicke sent me at the time, of what had passed with Mr Pitt upon that occasion in the first conferences with you, which not only justify you but all us, your friends and servants, who are accused for having suffered Mr Pitt *to remain in a dream all this while.* But I beg you would take no notice of that; we must still bring you together if we can, or nothing solid can be done....

I beg your pardon for troubling you with so long a letter. I am (whatever may be thought) a very sincere man to my friends. Where I make a profession, I defy any man to show one instance of my having ever departed from it. I love to speak out when I have anything upon my mind. I have done so now fully to you—I hope you will forgive it, and attribute it to the true cause. It would grieve me to the heart that, at a time when you are going to

[1] Above, p. 518.

give the essential proof of the greatness of your way of thinking with regard to your friends, by the sacrifice you are making to them, *I* who flatter myself in thinking that I have a principal share in that question and determination, should, from an over zeal and affection, or from a very groundless and undeserved jealousy, in my warmth, have dropped any expressions that should have given you any uneasiness; I most sincerely beg your pardon for them. Your Father, who knows me well, will tell you that it was always my fault, but so I am made. I hope my old friend would also say (for that is equally true) that it always proceeds with friends from a good and not a bad cause, and that it is over immediately.

It would be unreasonable in me to expect that you should write me a long letter in answer to this. I beg you would not, but only a few cheerful lines, that you are in good humour with me, and that, as a mark of it, you send me constant accounts of your proceedings; for I should be extremely hurt to find myself in any degree out of your secret. The Duchess of Newcastle sends her best compliments. I am, dear Sir,

Unalterably yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[On October 26, 1763 (N. 267, f. 92), Thomas Walpole writes to the Duke of Newcastle on the same subject. He had just been with Pitt at Hayes, where it has raised "a heavy cloud." Pitt was absolutely determined to state his opinion publicly, and had made himself master of the whole subject of privilege. Was] it possible to hesitate an instant betwixt the courtly chamber opinion of an Attorney and Solicitor-General and the solemn judicial determination of the Court of Common Pleas? [The ministry were mightily exulting in consequence of the Attorney-General's declaration that he would support his opinion in the House of Commons, and professed themselves sure of carrying everything before them, notwithstanding Mr Pitt's obstinacy.

Charles Yorke replies to the Duke on October 28 (N. 267, f. 103) with thanks for the latter's kind expressions towards him.] I see plainly that I have no rules to act by but those of honour and a fair character, without regard to consequences, to which I do assure your Grace that I stand so indifferent as to feel my mind quite composed upon that subject....

[On October 29, 1763 (N. 297, f. 119), the Duke of Newcastle writes on the same subject to the Duke of Cumberland, who is to come up to London to see Pitt and endeavour to settle the dispute.] In a point of privilege and in a point of law, Mr Pitt cannot expect that men of distinction and character will act contrary to their opinion, purely because Mr Pitt makes a point of it....

Duke of Newcastle to the Attorney-General

[N. 267, f. 152.] CLAREMONT, *Oct.* 31, 1763.

[Writes again to express his satisfaction and gratitude; nothing could have given him so much comfort.] I know and feel the great sacrifice you make, greater perhaps than it is, or has been, in the power of any other single man to make; but I think the whole kingdom, dissatisfied as it is, and will be, till some material alteration happens in the conduct of affairs, will see and admire this step in you, hope for the best consequences of it and will look upon you in a light, as far superior to the rest of your profession, in your conduct and in the manliness of your behaviour, as you are known and almost universally allowed to be in ability and knowledge, in your particular profession. This I will venture to assert, that from the Duke of Cumberland to the lowest of all those, who have any particular regard for, or any incidental connection with the Duke of Devonshire or the Duke of Newcastle, will think and act upon this principle; and that is a very additional comfort to me in consideration of this great question, which I have long viewed and considered, both as to its public and private consequences. Few of my letters are worth keeping, but this I beg you to *keep*.

[Expresses his anxiety at the state of Lord Hardwicke's health, whose valet sends him a report every day.]

Duke of Newcastle to H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland

[N. 267, f. 150.] CLAREMONT, *Oct.* 31, 1763.

[Announces Charles Yorke's resignation.] I shall not at present trouble your Royal Highness with any further observation upon it except that, as the Duke of Devonshire says, he makes a great sacrifice to his friends who will be extremely elated by it, and the ministers as much the contrary....

H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 267, f. 141.] Monday evening, past seven. [*Oct.* 31, 1763.]

I have this moment received yours with the material and agreeable news of the Attorney G[eneral]'s generous resolution. As M[r] Pitt will be here in a few minutes, I have not time to express the hopes it gives me, but I will endeavour to make the best use of that and of the intelligence relative to Wilkes[1].

If we all please, the disagreeable point of privilege may be avoided. Privilege and prerogative are dangerous points to touch in our constitution. I remain

Your very affectionate friend,

WILLIAM.

[1] The government had at this time dropped Wilkes's prosecution at law.

Marquess of Rockingham to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 267, f. 143.] *Oct.* 31, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,

Mr Pitt has just left me....Upon the material points of the difference of opinion with Mr Yorke, Mr Pitt was not quite in the temper of mind I could have wished, and dropped some harsh expressions, similar to those in the letter to your Grace. He seemed to attribute the Attorney-General's opinion to a desire of paying court etc. You may imagine how much I combated in favour of my friend, as I thought that construction much too severe. I had the Attorney-General's leave to acquaint Mr Pitt with his resignation, and tho' at first he seemed to say that it was not *material now*, and that the mischief was done in his having armed the Court etc. with his opinion to justify their proceeding[s] etc: etc:, yet I thought afterwards he seemed readier to allow that Mr Yorke's opinion might have been from his real judgment. Mr Pitt lamented that there should be any difference of opinion amongst us, and I am convinced his only meaning in laying the stress he does upon this affair, is from his present inclination to prefer (in case of opportunity) his friend Lord Chief Justice Pratt to Mr Yorke.

[Pitt gave again assurances of support, and declared, if such a scheme as the mortgaging the sinking fund, instead of imposing new taxes, were proposed, he would appear in the House of Commons to oppose it, "if he came in blankets."]...In short, barring on the subject of the Attorney-General, he was not displeasing in anything he dropped, and seemed very cordial....

Earl of Hardwicke to Viscount Royston

[H. 4, f. 438.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Oct.* 31, 1763.

My meagre diet is still rigorously insisted on. I cannot mention this without thanking good Lady Grey for the kind bill of fare which she sent me yesterday by Mouse[1], who presented it very genteely between her finger and her thumb. I read it over to my Lords and Masters[2], and passed the articles of rice, sago and salop with much approbation; but the material articles were condemned; calves foot was slippery and mucilaginous and crawfish broth only for persons quite recovered, who wanted nothing but strengthening, but too good for me. What a disappointment!...

[1] Lord Royston's little daughter.

[2] The doctors.

[The Attorney-General replies to the Duke of Newcastle on November 1 (N. 267, f. 170), with thanks for his kind letter.] It is not necessary for me, or any man, to be more than a private individual; but it is necessary for me to act with honour and according to my opinion and declarations....

Duke of Newcastle to H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland

[N. 267, f. 216.] CLAREMONT, *Nov.* 2, 1763.

...Charles Townshend[1] came in [to Lord Rockingham's] in a rage from Hayes, where he had been two hours that morning. He complained most heavily at what had passed; that Mr Pitt was in a violent fury, would do nothing, would concert with nobody, expected that everybody should follow him and his measures, without vouchsafing even to give his reason for his opinion; that for his part, he was against the privilege; that he would not in a point of that sort, differ from my Lord Hardwicke and the Attorney-General, except Mr Pitt would vouchsafe to give his reasons for that opinion; that Mr Pitt was furious, talked of nothing but separation; exclaimed against my Lord Mansfield, my Lord Hardwicke and the Attorney-General who, he supposed, had in concert settled this point of the privilege; that the Attorney-General had formerly got over my Lord Mansfield in the point of the *Habeas Corpus*, and that in return my Lord Mansfield had got over the Attorney-General in this point of the privilege[2]....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 267, f. 184.] CLAREMONT, *Nov.* 2, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,...

As well as I can recollect, Mr Pitt began with a general declaration against opposition; (which to your Grace he coloured with the specious description of Lord Bath's opposition); that the ministers were not to be removed that way; that their insufficiency and their conduct might bring it about.

His Royal Highness told him very strongly; "Mr Pitt, you don't know these gentlemen so well as I do. They are of two sorts —desperate men and obstinate men, and they will both stand it out to the last, and you deceive yourself, if you flatter yourself to the contrary; and if no opposition is given them, they will hold it and do what they please; and what will you have to answer for, if you don't make use of the present opportunity, but suffer these gentlemen to go on?...

[1] Grandson of Charles, second Viscount Townshend, the statesman (1728–1810); known as "Spanish Charles"; M.P. for Great Yarmouth; later created Lord Bayning.

[2] Also, ff. 235 and 237, to the Duke of Devonshire and Legge on the same subject, and the latter's reply, f. 239.

To the dinner and to all previous concert, Mr Pitt, as I understand, gave an absolute negative, and said that had the appearance of faction....

Mr Pitt exclaimed extremely against the Attorney-General, insisted most strongly upon his point of the privilege and upon his being supported in it.

His Royal Highness then introduced Mr Yorke's resignation, hoping that that might soften him a little; but on the contrary, Mr Pitt grew more violent, said he was sorry for it, that by this resignation Mr Yorke would have more influence in the opposition he would give to his great point of the privilege.

The Duke then took that up and showed how unreasonable it was that in a point of that nature, everything was to be given up, if everybody did not follow Mr Pitt's opinion in it; that privilege and prerogative should be very tenderly handled and well considered, before either of them should be made the subject of parliamentary discussion. [The Duke also explained how the whole topic might be avoided.] All this signified nothing.

Mr Pitt was as tenacious as ever, complained heavily of his usage from the Yorke family, and with his usual jealousy said that, considering the part the Attorney-General and his Father had acted in this affair, he did not know how far a deference to their opinion and advice might, from long acquaintance and partiality, influence the Duke of Newcastle and his friends in that quarter. [Considering the forbearance with which Pitt had been treated, this conduct now was very unkind; and it was hard to be accused on one side of putting Pitt at the head of the party and, on the other, of intriguing against him.]

His Royal Highness, however, not startled or put out of his way by these refusals, went to the bottom of the question, where the whole lies, and from whence the evil proceeds, and asked him—"Do you think, Mr Pitt, that you have left an impression with the King?" "I do, Sir." "I can assure you, you are mistaken; *you* are, at present, *the obnoxious man at Court*: the Duke of Newcastle was so some time ago, but that is otherwise now." All this he heard, but it did not seem to make any impression upon him.

The Duke told Mr Pitt strongly that this behaviour would give the greatest cause of triumph imaginable to the administration.

His Royal Highness did not think proper to say anything to Mr Pitt with regard to my opinion or conduct in the affair of the privilege, because he would not engage me in it, and His Royal Highness, I found, was of opinion that I should not differ with my Lord Hardwicke upon it. [H.R.H. was in despair and could not tell what to advise,—to do nothing or to go on without Pitt—the mischief attending both courses was so great. The Duke of Devonshire must give his opinion, which the Duke of Newcastle would follow.]...I see he [Pitt] is jealous of Mr Yorke, and fears that this last act of his will recommend him to our friends in such a manner as to give him with them the advantage over himself;

and if Mr Yorke's future conduct is, as I hope it will be, agreeable to the great and wise part which he has now taken, and Mr Pitt should continue in that irresolute and inactive situation in which he is at present, it will certainly have that consequence.

...If your Grace, with my Lord Temple's assistance (whose inclination I dare say is with us), could bring Mr Pitt back to his first idea of settling the Great Seal to the satisfaction both of the Attorney-General and my Lord Chief Justice Pratt which, considering their different situations and the different circumstances of their families, might possibly be done, perhaps more to the real inclination of my Lord Chief Justice Pratt than he may now care to own to Mr Pitt, I should hope all other difficulties might be got over. Your Grace once told me that my Lord Temple said to you, "You and I must settle this affair of the Attorney-General."...

Charles Townshend says Mr Pitt is persuaded that he shall be sent for again, and attributes his present behaviour to that....

CLAREMONT, *Nov. 4th*, 1763.

[He had seen Lord Hardwicke concerning whom the doctors declared there was no danger; but it would be some time before he regained his health and could attend the House of Lords.] That, in the present situation, is a very unfortunate circumstance for us. Poor man! I am sure he is highly pleased with the great and noble part which his son, the Attorney-General, has taken.

I met by appointment Mr Yorke at my Lord Rockingham's, who gave us a full account of what passed the day before with the King in the Closet upon the resignation of his office; and it was my Lord Rockingham's opinion as well as my own, that nothing ever was more judicious, more manly, more proper, more kind to his friends and with more dignity than what Mr Yorke said to the King upon this occasion. I shall give your Grace as short and as true an account of it as I can.

Mr Yorke began by thanking the King for His Majesty's goodness to him and to his family; that he had endeavoured to serve His Majesty to the best of his power, but that now there was no further utility in his service; that during the last session he looked upon things to be in an unsettled or temporary situation, that he flattered himself some means would have been found out to bring about such a reconciliation with those, whose assistance he thought so necessary for His Majesty's service, as might have formed such an administration as might have carried on His Majesty's affairs with ease and success. He now saw with concern that that was not the case; that those, with whom he had ever been connected, continued to be excluded from His Majesty's service, and that he must consult his own honour and character; that in that situation he could be of no service to the King; that everybody knew his connection and the very long friendship which there had been between the Duke of Newcastle and his Father; that the Duke of Newcastle had long been at the head of affairs and (he was pleased

to say) had carried them on with ability and success and to the satisfaction of the nation; that His Majesty, on coming to the Crown, had found such an administration so composed as had carried on a most expensive, but most successful, war with the greatest glory and to the satisfaction of the whole nation, and had put the credit and reputation of this country in the highest light, with the universal approbation of all sorts of people,—this was said particularly alluding to M^r^ Pitt,—that upon His Majesty's accession he had commanded the Duke of Newcastle to continue in his service, which he did with the same zeal and with the same good inclination that he had done in the reign of his grandfather, and remained there till he found he could be of no farther service; that the case of the Duke of Devonshire was the same, a man, whose own abilities and great consequence in the kingdom and his known zeal for His Majesty and his Royal Family, procured him the high esteem and regard of all those who wished well to His Majesty and the nation, the merit of whose family was remembered and considered in the highest light; that under these circumstances, the Duke of Devonshire had received great marks of disapprobation (and something stronger; I am not sure whether it was not) and indignity; that this treatment of the Duke of Devonshire had been the occasion that the Marquess of Rockingham had left His Majesty's service; that these two great men were at the head of, and had the greatest influence in, the northern parts of this country, the greatest, the most considerable and best affected part of His Majesty's dominions; that these were the persons with whom he (the Attorney-General) was connected, and that when he saw these Lords had no part in His Majesty's administration, he could be of no service to it.

That with regard to himself, an Attorney-General could not be of service, or do his duty (which was to give his opinion to the King according to his conscience, sometimes agreeable, sometimes otherwise to His Majesty), except he has the real confidence of his ministers; that that was so far from being his case that in a memorable instance, the last winter, he had given an opinion relating to the number of troops to be kept up in Ireland, which differed from that of some of the ministers, and perhaps might not be at that time agreeable to His Majesty. What treatment did he receive from His Majesty's ministers? A meeting was summoned of above forty members of the House of Commons (the Tories) by His Majesty's ministers where the Attorney-General's opinion was canvassed, when never one word had been said previously to him about that opinion, nor was he (the Attorney-General) suffered even to be present at that meeting to defend and support his own opinion.

His Majesty replied—"I remember that case very well; I did not approve it; that was done by one man, I need not tell you who; you know him; that was not the only instance in which that man had proposed things not for the service of you and your family

which I resisted[1]." His Majesty, I think, was not very kind to that man by this confession, and yet *that man* is now coming over [from abroad] to bear a principal part in support of His Majesty's measures and ministers.

Mr Yorke at last instanced the case of his own Father, which, he said, had made a great impression upon him, tho' it did not seem to have done so with his Father; that my Lord Hardwicke had been commanded by the late King to assist at his Council, after he had resigned the Great Seal; that he had done so and given the best attendance and advice in his power; that His Majesty, upon his coming to the Crown, had commanded him also to continue to attend his Council, which he had done in the same manner as in the former reign; that my Lord Hardwicke was afterwards left out of the summons to the Cabinet Council without the least notice taken of it to him, or one word being said by any one of his ministers to my Lord Hardwicke upon it. His Majesty spoke with respect and regard of my Lord Hardwicke, but said nothing particular in answer to what Mr Yorke had said relating to the Council.

I forgot to observe that in talking upon my subject, Mr Yorke instanced strongly the most extraordinary manner in which my friends had been treated, both in and out of Parliament.

There is one remarkable circumstance. Mr Yorke, in talking of Mr Pitt and Mr Yorke's connections, said that he had had an intimate connection and friendship with Mr Pitt ever since his (Yorke's) coming into the world to 1755, when Mr Pitt went out; that even ever since, tho' the same intimacy had not subsisted, they had always been upon a foot of great civility with each other. The King seemed *much struck*, and said remarkably—"This is the first moment that I ever heard that there had been any friendship between you"—a proof that Mr Pitt had spoke very strongly to His Majesty against Mr Yorke.

Upon the whole, the King said not one single word in favour of, or against any one of us; but said only he was very sorry that the reconciliation had not happened (alluding I suppose to Mr Pitt's negotiation), that His Majesty had wished it very much; that it was not his fault that it had not been.—And this was all.

The King was very civil to the Attorney-General, and Mr Attorney-General very dutiful in his expressions to the King. His Majesty mentioned nothing particular but the affair of the privilege, and no other part of the question relating to Wilkes. Mr Yorke replied—"Sir, as I have given Your Majesty my opinion upon this point, whenever it comes in question, I shall act pursuant to it."

I forgot to mention what I should have done before, that in talking about the administration and upon the King's complaining of the insults to Government etc:, His Majesty said,—"But this is general; it is not confined to London only; it is all over the kingdom. We hear of insurrections, and tumults in every part of the country; there is no government, no law etc:"

[1] Fox.

The Attorney-General took that up extremely properly and in support of his own resolution, then executing. He observed that that was extremely to be lamented; that for that reason he wished that His Majesty had the service and assistance of those persons, whose credit in the kingdom might give satisfaction, and prevent these disorders at home, as well as support the honour and interest of His Majesty and this country abroad.

I can't express to your Grace the satisfaction which this manly behaviour in Mr Yorke, and his distinct account of it, gave to my Lord Rockingham and myself.

I found after it ended that Mr Yorke seemed greatly to wish that we would let our friends act as they should think proper, and applied himself particularly to me in the affair of the privilege. He thinks himself so strong upon the question that he shall be able to convince all unprejudiced persons, and I find would be much mortified if we (and myself in particular) should lay any injunctions upon them to the contrary. I did not care for myself to make any positive promise *yet* upon it, tho' I think what Mr Yorke desires is very reasonable; but I love to have a little more time for reflection and concert, and perhaps to talk it over quietly and the consequences of it, with Mr Yorke alone.

But the Marquess from the honesty of his heart, notwithstanding the partiality he has for Mr Pitt, is now so provoked with him that he declared clearly and strongly to Mr Yorke that he thought his behaviour had been so great and so meritorious to us, that we were obliged in honour and gratitude to engage our friends to support him in this point of the privilege. Mr Yorke, as you may imagine, was mightily pleased, and I said nothing in contradiction to the Marquess upon it, and I suppose it may finally end so, or at least to suffer our friends to go according to their own opinion and inclination, which is all Mr Yorke seems to ask at present. But I think everything ought to be tried to make Mr Pitt reasonable to a degree and to prevent a breach, which I whispered to my Lord Rockingham, I was afraid this resolution would bring about....

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 18, f. 373.] HAGUE, *Nov.* 5, 1763.

...The substance of your letter surprised me a good deal and not agreeably....I can easily conceive the embarrassing situation he must have been in, and every man is to judge of what relates to his own honour. I should have been glad to know, however, whether he goes out entirely upon his own opinion, or whether he takes that step in concert with the leading persons in the present minority in Parliament....If the latter, upon what terms does he unite with his old friends, and what consideration is to be showed him in any future settlement of our unfortunate and divided country? I have

not, to speak fairly, seen any of our principal men, who have steered the helm since I have been in the world, to whom I would have lent my paws to pull the chestnuts out of the fire and to embark in a system with them. I would choose to see my way. It would grieve me to see my brother Charles stop short in his career, because I have the highest opinion of his integrity and abilities, and think my country stands in need of the assistance of such men as him....As to my brother John, you only just mention his being to follow Charles's steps without mentioning the motives, and add a paragraph which, I suppose, is to prepare me for a summons from my friends to quit too, or else for an order from above as a punishment for belonging so nearly to the voluntary resigners....You know I am placed in a double capacity in the King's service as ambassador and as a military man. In both I have been better treated than I deserve, and therefore cannot pretend to any personal cause of complaint....If, therefore, I am left quietly at my post, I am not warm enough in party, nor of consequence on either side to think of doing anything but my duty and continuing to serve the King as heretofore[1]....

[On November 5, 1763 (N. 267, f. 245), the Duke of Newcastle writes to Charles Yorke owning that his opinion, though he has not studied the subject, is rather in favour of the privilege.] I don't see how it can be called *a breach of the Peace*; there is no *overt act*, no tumult, no insurrection, occasioned by this libel, suppose it is proved to be so. A private man is precluded from obtaining his just debt on account of [t]his privilege. Does not that seem more unjust than that a prosecution for a libel should be delayed? We are to see things in every light. Such ignorant and desperate ministers as these may endeavour to support their power by *cageing* (as my Lord Cowper called it) members of Parliament, whom they don't like. [He desired to talk it over quietly and Mr Pitt knew nothing of his opinion.

Charles Yorke replies the same day (f. 248) expressing his satisfaction at the approbation with which his action was regarded.] Indeed, my dear Lord, in a less heated state of the times, every honest man would see that government is undone in this country, if privilege is taken in such an extent. It will be the only *arbitrary* thing known to this Constitution. The King is bounded by law and the private subject must observe the laws, but a member of Parliament is above them, in *almost* everything except a capital offence....

Marquess of Rockingham to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 267, f. 286.] *Nov.* 8, 1763.

...I recommended [to Lord Temple] that, if Mr Pitt and Mr Yorke did differ in opinion, that it might not be with

[1] See below, p. 554.

warmth etc: and that, if it was possible, it should be contrived that the House should see that, if they disagreed upon the point of privilege, that there was other points in that affair on which they did agree, and how inclined and determined they were to act together. I told Lord Temple that Mr Pitt would not hear Mr Yorke on the subject. Lord Temple begs to see Mr Yorke, is highly pleased with his resignation etc: and wants to talk with him on the subject, and in the whole course of our conversation expressed himself with great regard for Mr Yorke, his family etc: etc:...

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 267, f. 288.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov.* 8, 1763, at night.

MY DEAR LORD,

This night completes the month during which I have been absolutely confined, not only to my house but almost to two rooms. In that time I have run through the whole *materia medica* that could have any relation to my case. And not only run through it, but over and over again; for we have gone in a circle and proved what Archbishop Abbot said to King James the First —that the English physicians excelled chiefly in the great powers of the Church—those of *binding* and *loosing*. I don't say this by way of complaint, for I don't know that they could do better. The worst of it is that after all, yesterday and last night were the worst day and night that I have passed during my illness. I have for some time had a suspicion in my head that my present distemper might either take its rise from, or have some connexion with, that complaint under which I suffered so much at Wimpole in the year 1759....All this is in the hands of God, and to him I submit. I am at present easy, tho' very low and much enfeebled. One thing I lament, that it will hinder me from being useful either to my friends or the public, for a great while.

I beg pardon for being so long upon this subject, which was not the business of this letter. That was to acquaint your Grace with a resolution very lately fixed, which will be carried into execution before the end of the week. Ever since Charles had determined to resign, my son John has been very uneasy, and thought his continuing in office would put him in a very awkward situation and render him liable to jealousies and suspicions on both sides, and might be interpreted as a reserve for the family with the Court. I have had no hand in this, but as he is a young man of many good

qualities and particularly of a great deal of honour, he is fixed and will wait upon my Lord Halifax for this purpose before the end of the week....As to Sir Joseph, care has lately been taken to acquaint him with all this in a proper manner. As he is in a foreign residence and will at present have nothing to do in Parliament, I suppose he may be left to events and to what the ministry will think fit to resolve concerning him. This is the state of the case and whatever becomes of me, I shall be pleased to leave my family in the same honourable friendships and connexions in which I have lived and intend to die....

I have made the first part of my letter so long that I have tired myself....I am, as you have long known me, most cordially and unalterably, my dearest Lord, ever yours

HARDWICKE.

Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke

[H. 74, f. 349; N. 267, f. 310.] CLAREMONT, *Nov.* 9, 1763.

MY DEAREST DEAREST LORD,

Never any letter made so much impression upon the most sincere and grateful friend as your most tender and kind letter has this moment made upon me. Such a mark of the most constant and the most invariable friendship and affection scarce was ever received from one friend to another before. I can never forget it, nor the kind disposition showed throughout the whole of all your dear children's right and affectionate way of thinking and acting. How can any children do wrong that come from such a Father? My wishes are confined at present to your health...and I trust in God that I shall have the pleasure to find you tomorrow about one o'clock greatly better in all respects; I pray God grant it!...

Unalterably Yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

George Onslow to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 267, f. 300.] *Nov.* 9, 1763.

...I must give your Grace the satisfaction of knowing how M^r^ Yorke was received the first day of Term in Westminster Hall. The moment he entered the whole room began to shout; when M^r^ Wilbraham and M^r^ Hoskins, the two oldest barristers, conducted him into Court behind the Bar. Wilbraham was upon his

legs to move the Chancellor that Mr Yorke, in consequence of the unanimous request of every senior barrister, should sit first below the Bar, but the Chancellor prevented him by calling first on Mr Yorke to know if he had anything to move, and so gave him the precedency[1]....

Marquess of Rockingham to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[H. 82, f. 7.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Nov.* 14, 1763.

DEAR SIR,

I have seen several members of Parliament this day with some of whom I am intimately connected and in truth I must say that, tho' I found all of them full of the highest regard for you and extremely wishing to show their respect to your opinion, yet upon the present question their opinions (so strongly biassed by their inclination not to concur with administration) seem fully to determine them to embrace the opportunity now offered.

Those amongst them, who will reason at all upon the subject, allege (that from appearances of the readiness of the present Government to adopt, and the notions they and their predecessors may have imbued into great personages—) that they shall be exceeding unwilling to give way into any system of constructive crimes.

I am sure the more I enlarge upon this topic, the more I shall betray my own ignorance; but if I could convey to you how sincerely I should rejoice on any occasion to show the most unfeigned personal regard for you, I should be most thoroughly happy. But if the torrent carries away upon the present point those, who[m] you might think I might persuade, I must beg you would do me the justice not to blame me, and to do them the justice not to attribute it to personal predilection, but to the opinion they have in general adopted, that the times make the necessity. I am ever, dear Sir, with the greatest truth and regard, your most obedient servant and sincere friend

ROCKINGHAM.

[1] See Foss, *Biog. Dict.* 789: "On his quitting office he [Charles Yorke] attended the Court on the outside bar in his stuff gown, although when appointed Solicitor-General to the Prince of Wales in 1754 he had received a patent of precedence, deeming probably that that patent was...void." Subsequently, he received a re-grant of the patent of precedence. This seems to show that he had not taken the rank of K.C. as stated in the *Lincoln's Inn Black Books*, iii. 356, 359.

George Onslow to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 267, f. 354.] *Nov.* 15, 1763.

Everything would be as well as possible, if Mr Yorke had not thought fit to give a strange opinion[1] and consequently vote on our first question in regard to reading the Bill.

Numbers on that $\frac{300}{111}$.

Every one of our people with us except the Yorke family....

George Onslow to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 268, f. 16.] *Nov.* 23, 1763. 5 o'clock.

My Lord,

Though we are not come to a division, I cannot a moment delay giving your mind the ease and joy it will receive from knowing that Mr Yorke has spoke and declared with us[2]. The effect it has had is not to be described by anything but by the division, when I'm sure it will appear. Mr Pitt's look and gesture of joy and approbation was the most remarkable thing in the world, and the Cavendishes particularly, and all of us, are happy beyond measure. We shall certainly do great things, particulars of which I shall hope your servant will be here to receive about 8 o'clock....

[N. 268, f. 37.] [*Nov.* 24, 1763.] 9 o'clock.

...Hussey has made the finest speech that ever was heard, *for* us. I wish Charles Yorke's had not been full as violent *against* us[3], but it was not half so well received. He spoke two hours and laboured it too much. Mr Pitt is now answering him, and does it coolly and finely....

Lord Royston to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[H. 13, f. 53.] n. d.

Dear Brother,...

I had a long conversation on Sunday with Lord Temple, a great deal of which was not much to the purpose, tho' upon the whole it was confidential and frank on his part. I complained strongly of Pitt's speech, I mean the general doctrines of it and the abuse of the Profession, taking care to do justice to his

[1] On a point of procedure connected with the privilege. See above, p. 477.

[2] For postponing the debate, p. 477.

[3] On the main question of privilege. See p. 478.

manner of treating you. His Lordship admitted it was not one of his best performances, and that his temper was too apt to be heated, and that he wished some things in it had been otherwise.

Yours in haste,

ROYSTON.

P.S. I told Lord Temple that all the great acts for liberty had been obtained by *lawyers*[1].

Duke of Newcastle to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[N. 268, f. 55.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Nov.* 25, 1763.

DEAR SIR,

Tho' I have the misfortune to differ with you in this point, I cannot conceal the joy and satisfaction which the universal applause, which is given you from all quarters, upon what passed yesterday, has given me. All our friends speak of it with admiration and pleasure, and you can't know so well as I do how far it goes, and what good effects I flatter myself with from it....

Duke of Devonshire to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 269, f. 15.] BATH, *Dec.* 17, 1763.

...Lord Chief Justice Pratt is come. I walked half an hour yesterday morning on the Parade with him; we talked over the times. I told him my mind about M^r^ Pitt and that I was in doubt, if he continued so impracticable, whether I should not retire. He endeavoured to excuse and soften his conduct, and said if I took that step the thing was over. I said I should take no resolution till I came to town. M^r^ Pitt had the holydays to consider of it, and if I found there was no union nor concert, I should consult with my friends and do what I thought right. I was pleased with him; he talked very reasonably, mentioned of himself the difference with the Yorke family; saw the necessity of a union with them, and expressed his wish that he and M^r^ Yorke could come together and talk over the business of Westminster Hall. He did not believe, if they talked over points previously, that they should differ, and expressed himself very handsomely in regard to M^r^ Yorke. I wish you would be cautious how you mention this, even when you think it may do good, for that will depend upon the temper of mind that people are in....

[1] See vol. i. p. 141.

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 269, f. 62.] CLAREMONT, *Dec.* 19, 1763.

MY DEAR LORD,...

He [Charles Yorke] said remarkably that Mr Pitt had showed more civility to him in the last debate than he believed he had ever done to anybody who had differed with him before. Mr Yorke attributed that to a sense, which Mr Pitt had, that he had injured him, and to the impression Mr Yorke's speech had made upon Mr Pitt, and which Mr Pitt saw it had made upon the House; for that Mr Pitt seemed very short and defective in his answer and much embarrassed. I added, might it not have been from a better matured reason to show an inclination to forget all that had passed and to be reconciled?

Mr Yorke talked of Mr Pitt's manner of treating everybody, to which I replied as usual; nobody had felt more of that than myself, and submitted to it all from my firm opinion that this country would never be in quiet till Mr Pitt had a very considerable share in the administration, which he seemed to admit. And I really think that, if Mr Pitt would hold forth a generous hand, all would come right; but Mr Yorke must absolutely have the Seals or the family will never be easy. I hear my friend Legge intends at a distance, to touch my Lord Chief Justice Pratt upon the subject, imagining that he may like a peerage and good emoluments for his family (of which he is in need) [more] than the Great Seal *alone* with the peerage....

I inclose to your Grace a dictated note, which I have received this moment from my Lord Hardwicke. The first part of it relates to the state of his health, which gives me, as I am sure it will give your Grace, the greatest and truest pleasure. The part underlined at the end of it gives me most inexpressible concern, for it can mean nothing but his forgetting the part we (myself especially) have acted towards his son in the late affair, and our giving up everything and everybody to Mr Pitt. It is indeed too agreeable to his discourse he held to me during his illness....

Earl of Hardwicke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 269, f. 78.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Dec.* 19, 1763.

Lord Hardwicke presents his most respectful compliments to the Duke and Duchess of Newcastle....

Lord Hardwicke has been so much reduced that he was as weak as a child of two years old, but hopes by the blessing of God (he goes on so well in his amendment) that he shall pick up strength by degrees, and lives in hopes of seeing the Duke and Duchess of Newcastle, like one risen from the dead. They may be assured, if

he has drank any Lethean water, it has not the least impaired the impressions of his great obligations to them; *tho', if it has totally extinguished in him the memory of certain modern politics, he shall not in the least regret it*[1]....

Duke of Newcastle to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[N. 269, f. 196; H. 81, f. 153.] CLAREMONT, *Dec.* 25, 1763.

[Expresses his renewed anxiety at Lord Hardwicke's state of health.]...I found the Duke [of Cumberland] just what I could wish him, wise, prudent, considerate, determined. His Royal Highness soon began—"I am in love with the Yorkes, and I have not said that before. I wish they knew it. I rejoice to hear that my Lord Hardwicke is recovered (I pray God, it may be so!). I long for an opportunity of seeing him, and telling him so myself, and also what I say to you. I want also to have some discourse with him upon my own subject and conduct." This made me happier than I can express to you (whatever your jealousy may make you think of me). I told His Royal Highness that I rejoiced to hear him talk so; that I should not fail to let you know it, and that I was sure it would make a great impression upon you and your family.

He talked with the utmost and highest regard for my Lord Hardwicke, and indeed very properly upon all subjects and all points. He said there must be a thorough reconciliation between M^r^ Yorke and M^r^ Pitt; that that was *his* point, that without that nothing was to be done, and in the doing it His Royal Highness talked with the greatest respect and consideration for Mr Yorke.

[He himself had thoroughly agreed and had said that H.R.H. could do more to bring about the happy result than anyone.] I must do the Duke the justice to say that in everything he said he proposed ample satisfaction and consideration for you.

I have now told you the simple fact, and leave you to make your own observations upon it. I will never deceive you; my judgment may be erroneous, but I think generally I come out to be as much in the right as others. For my part, I think with the Duke that the whole depends upon this reconciliation, and even that the salvation of the country, the honour, credit, reputation and success of all your friends (and I had almost added but I must beg your pardon beforehand) your own depend upon it[2].

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[1] See *Grenville Papers*, ii. 241.

[2] Also N. 269, f. 194 to Lord Rockingham, to the same effect.

Hon. Charles Yorke to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 269, f. 219; H. 81, f. 155.] *Dec.* 26, 1763.

[Lord Hardwicke is better but still far from recovery.] In the meantime your Grace will approve my taking no notice of anything in your letter. Nor could I advise the least circumstance to be thrown in Lord Hardwicke's way at present, leading to ideas of public business and personal situations. When he returns to air, nourishment and exercise, such thoughts may be entertained without inconvenience. I am sure that he will receive, as he ought, the grace and condescension of His Royal Highness. As to myself, no man can have a deeper sense of it than I have, nor can be more sensibly touched with duty and gratitude for the least mark of his countenance and good opinion. I know the weight of his great talents, both in the Royal Family and the public. But indeed, my dear Lord, I do not see my way. The whole stress has been laid upon a single point, in which I have unfortunately differed; and for the rest, your Grace sees that M^r^ Pitt's sagacity suggests to him that nothing can be done in Parliament....

Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Devonshire

[N. 269, f. 233.] CLAREMONT, *Dec. 27th*, 1763.

...I am sorry to say his [Charles Yorke's] answer is not a clever one....But yet I know the Yorkes better than any of you, their merit and their weaknesses. I know it was right to let them know the disposition of the Duke towards them; that will bring them back sooner than anything. They fancy, tho' without the least foundation, that we shall all give them up to M^r^ Pitt without taking any care of them.

Charles Yorke remarkably says, "he don't see his way"; let him see his way, and all will do....

Duke of Newcastle to Lord Royston

[H. 77, f. 47.] CLAREMONT, *Jan.* 3, 1764.

MY DEAR LORD,...

I now flatter myself again that Providence will preserve to us that great and good man, my Lord Hardwicke, for the sake of his country, his family, his friends, amongst the first of whom I must have the vanity to reckon myself, the oldest, the longest and, I hope, as grateful and as sincere as any of them. If an uninterrupted friendship, an intimate and almost daily correspondence, attended with constant marks of confidence and affection, with a reciprocal concern for everything that interested or concerned each

other, a continued union of conduct and behaviour and even of opinion and sentiment, more than I have known in any other instance, can form a reciprocal friendship, it must be in our case. [Expresses the variation of his anxious hopes and fears during Lord Hardwicke's illness.] I have one more reason to add to the former, to save the University...from the eternal reproach which must fall upon them for having suffered themselves to have one of their first officers imposed upon them by the most unheard of violence and the corrupt influence of power against one, who has all the claims to their friendship, that gratitude, propriety, merit and spotless character can entitle him to[1]. I have never presumed to trouble your Lordship upon this subject. I know how irksome it was to myself to think or act upon it, much more must it be so to your Lordship. That very consideration made me delay, as long as I could, taking the necessary measures upon a supposition that a vacancy might happen, till I found that our antagonist was using all arts and endeavours to carry his point by a prostitution of the King's name in a manner never before attempted, even in the strongest days of loyalty and subjection in either University. I am sorry to acquaint your Lordship that at my first trial, I found many grave and serious men, and such as I thought I had a right to influence in such a question as this, which so nearly concerned myself, not only declared and engaged for my Lord Sandwich but avowing those principles of interest and subjection which I thought no man, especially a Divine, would have *owned*, at least for his own sake. [Enumerates several names of persons who have resisted these mischievous influences*.]

[N. 270, f. 196.] ST JAMES'S SQUARE, *Jan.* 16, 1764.

Lord Royston thinks it proper to acquaint Mr Jones for the Duke of Newcastle's information, that Lord Hardwicke has been apprised of this Cambridge contest—that he received the account very calmly, and only said that he did not know that he should leave anything behind him which was worth making so much bustle about. He expressed, however, his sense of the indecency of Lord Sandwich's manner of timing his applications and conducting his canvass, pretty strongly.—Lord Royston did not choose to enter at first into too large a detail.

[1] The candidature of Lord Sandwich as successor to Lord Hardwicke as Steward of the University of Cambridge, see p. 484.

* N.B. This is a very handsome letter.—The Duke of Newcastle endeavoured to recommend himself to us by a strenuous exertion of interest at Cambridge...I was very indifferent in that matter, as not thinking it led to anything material, and that such a mere feather, even from a respectable body, when not made an unanimous compliment, was scarcely worth acceptance. H. [Elsewhere the second Lord H. complains of the trouble, expense and obligations into which he was drawn by the importunity of the Duke and his brother in this matter. H. 80, f. 8; H. 309, f. 42; N. 270, f. 126.]

Earl of Hardwicke to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[H. 5, f. 355.] GROSVENOR SQUARE, *Feb.* 7, 1764.

[He sends the numbers of the division upon the Marriage Bill in the House of Commons in 1753.

Yeas 125, Noes 56.

The objection about the sailors mentioned in the debates then can have no substantial foundation, if no instances can now be produced after the Act has been in force ten years[1].]

Duke of Newcastle to H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland

[N. 270, f. 448.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Feb.* 12, 1764.

...There are hopes that we shall have the Yorkes tomorrow. I saw my Lord Hardwicke on Friday. He was in very good humour and said, speaking of the ministers—"What do they bring upon themselves by their ignorance? They have brought the business of Monday upon them by that; my son Charles will be there on Monday[2]; he does not seem to be disposed to *compliment* the administration upon that point."

George Onslow to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 270, f. 458.] *Feb.* 13, 1764.

...The spirit of the House is vastly with us. Lord John [Cavendish] is more positive than ever about the Yorkes. If he is right, the day will be nearly ours....

Duke of Newcastle to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[N. 270, f. 495.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Feb.* 15, 1764.

DEAR SIR,

My friend West and George Onslow came to my bedside from the House of Commons to acquaint me with the glorious day and night which they had had in the House, and with the great and meritorious part which you had had in it. Allow me most sincerely to congratulate you and my country upon it, and particularly to return you my thanks for having given me a peace of mind which I have not had for many months. My great and valuable good friend gave me some distant hints of it some days ago; I am sure he is pleased with it.

No man in England is more happy upon the occasion than myself; for whatever you may think, or may have thought (tho' I

[1] See vol. ii. pp. 65–6. [2] February 13, see p. 479.

have not for some time had so much of your confidence and conversation as others), no one man in England, (I don't except your own family) has more real and true regard and affection for you or concern for your honour, figure, interest and reputation than myself, and no coolness can ever alter that disposition in me, towards you....

I think I see a greater prospect of a happy turn of affairs, which must produce some settlement and some system, than I have ever yet done. Allow an old man to conclude with a schoolboy's quotation

Macte tua virtute—sic hinc ad astra.

I am with the greatest sincerity and affection, dear Sir, ever most faithfully yours

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

James West to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 270, f. 419.] Friday night [*Feb.* 17, 1764].

After a good deal of altercation upon several amendments proposed to the question, whereon were several small and (I was afraid) little offensive altercations between Mr P[itt] and Mr Y[orke], the amendments were agreed to viz: to add *and treasonable* after the words [sic] *seditious*, and after the last words *according to the practice of* [*the*] *Secretary's office and often produced in the King's Bench and never decided by that Court, tho' there are warrants on which there have been orders for discharging, bailing and remanding*[1].

On the whole question the Attorney-General proposed the adjourning the question in a very long speech. Mr Yorke has answered him in the most masterly manner possible, and to the entire satisfaction of Mr P[itt] and all our friends with the utmost applause. Lord North is answering him. Our friends in great spirits.

Charles Townshend is come.

Egerton gone into the country.

Cooke in flannels.

Dundas brought in on men's shoulders.

Lord Catherlough like a ghost.

Lord Charles Spencer[2] sent to from Blenheim to stay away.

Half-past nine.

George Onslow to the Duke of Newcastle

[N. 271, f. 19.] Friday night [*Feb.* 17, 1764].

Everybody almost is down of both sides. My Lord, we have been and still are employed in forming the question, which I believe will be done soon without a division. We have had some

[1] The final wording of the amendment was somewhat different; see p. 480.

[2] M.P. for Oxfordshire; Comptroller of the Household; son of the third Duke of Marlborough.

rubs in the course of it, such as Charles Yorke's differing *totally* with Conway and in some measure at one time with Mr Pitt; but by great prudence and very good behaviour of Charles Yorke, all that is quite over, and we are hastening to the main point in regard to which everything appears in our favour....Pitt very ill but in excellent spirits.

[Endorsed by the Duke of Newcastle] I don't understand any part of this letter. I think, however, that we are all agreed at last.

[N. 271, f. 21.]

MY DEAREST LORD,

Joy, joy to *you* in particular. I cannot a moment defer telling you that Mr Yorke has this moment closed the noblest performance that ever was heard, and what added to it was that it was an answer to the most beastly and brutal speech of Norton's, who said he would treat the opinion of Parliament on this matter as the opinion of a drunken porter. Mr Yorke said he always made it his greatest pride to pay attention and devotion to it. We all think the thing is over. Nothing ever met with such applause as Charles Yorke. Pitt is in love with him and so we are all. God be praised. I think now we shall, as Mr Pitt said, crush our domestic enemies as we have our foreign ones.

Duke of Newcastle to Mr Shelley

[N. 271, f. 53.] *Feb.* 20, 1764.

DEAR SIR,

I have not troubled you with any parliamentary questions of late. There is one which every sentiment of honour, affection and gratitude obliges me to support to the utmost of my power; and that is that my old friend, my Lord Hardwicke, who for upwards of forty years, has been the most zealous, the most affectionate, and the most useful friend to me, to my family, and every branch of it, should not now be mortified by rejecting a Bill which has been in force so many years, purely out of dislike to my Lord Hardwicke and his family; especially after his son has done the utmost service to our cause by the greatest, the most able performance that ever was made in the House of Commons[1]. I shall conclude by saying that I shall never look upon any man, tho' ever so nearly related to me, who does not oppose the repeal of this Bill at this time, to be any friend of mine. The worthy and amiable brothers of the Duke of Devonshire, tho' by no means friends to the Marriage Bill, will reason and act like men; and it would grieve me that so near a relation of mine as yourself should be alone in opposition to us. I could not from the sincerity of my heart avoid saying so much to you. I am, dear Sir, very affectionately yours,

HOLLES NEWCASTLE.

[1] Above, p. 480.

Duke of Newcastle to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[N. 271, f. 83.] NEWCASTLE HOUSE, *Feb.* 24, 1764.

[After expressing his renewed anxiety at the unfavourable accounts of Lord Hardwicke, he continues] The Duke of Newcastle just called upon Mr Pitt, who still keeps his bed, to tell him that he had executed his commission to Mr Yorke, which was very kindly and properly received. Mr Pitt repeated last night to the Duke of Devonshire (if possible) in stronger terms than he did to me, his great approbation of and satisfaction with Mr Yorke's conduct. He said very properly and very strongly, talking of the future proceedings, that nothing must be proposed which could either renew former points in which we might have differed amongst ourselves, or bring on any point on which we could possibly differ now. Mr Pitt said he could not presume to send for Mr Yorke, but that he had left word with his porter that, whenever Mr Yorke did him the honour to call, he should be let in, and Mr Pitt would be very glad to see him.

[Charles Yorke replies the same day (N. 271, f. 85) thanking the Duke for his kind offices and announcing his intention of visiting Pitt as soon as his present state of indisposition will allow him.]

Lord Royston to the Hon. Charles Yorke

[H. 13, f. 61.] ST JAMES'S SQUARE, *March 6th*, 1764.

DEAR BROTHER,...

I suppose you will have heard from Harrison that this grievous stroke is fallen; God's will be done but we shall all feel it severely....When I was at Grosvenor Square, I went in to kiss my dear and honoured Father for the last time, and did not think then that he could hold out many hours.

Yours affectionately and most afflicted

H.

Hon. Charles Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 13, f. 63.] 4 o'clock Tuesday.

When I was in Grosvenor Square this morning, I thought the struggle could not last many hours. He had the felicity to expire without pain. In every light the loss is inexpressible; to the public in many ways, but at this time most especially to his family. But the hand of God has kindly removed him *suo tempore, alieno Reipublicae**.

* Lord Hardwicke's death was indeed a very great loss to his family. Had he lived two or three years longer,—which from his appearance [in] the summer [of] 1763 there was the greatest prospect of,—it would have fixed my brother's fortunes, allowing that other contingencies had been the same. H.

Major-General the Hon. Sir Joseph Yorke to Lord Royston

[H. 19, f. 48.] HAGUE, *March 13th*, 1764.

DEAR BROTHER,

My heart is too full to say much. God's will be done. The stroke is a heavy one tho', as you say, long expected. Indeed, from the first moment I heard our ever to be honoured and beloved Father had relapsed, I inwardly despaired of his recovery and endeavoured to prepare my mind for so severe a separation, which sinks deep into it. When I reflect upon all we owe him and me in particular, a tender concern gets the better of me and the void in my life seems impossible to be filled. His worth, his merit, his long services were for me the foundation of my fortune and success. He is gone, alas, and I must submit....

The career of a great and good man must needs close thus, amidst grief and the bitter feelings of personal bereavement. But it is not with a sense of loss, but rather of gain, as of a possession for all time, that we ourselves lay down the history of his life.

Like the great masterpieces of the art of Greece it was complete, consistent, and symmetrical, expressed in a few broad and simple lines, and with all the balance and sobriety of classic inspiration. There was perfect unison and proportion in all its parts; in none was there any excess or extravagance.

Moreover, just as the figures of that ancient art present themselves to the spectator, with no side movements or flexions of the limbs to detract from their pristine majesty and dignity, so does this great man, in his life and personality, in which were no starts or turns, no inconsistencies which demand explanation or palliation, no lights or shades which require adjustment, face posterity, with the same grandeur and simplicity of motive, with the same finality, clearness and completeness, and with the same calmness, certainty and repose.

These are qualities which could not have existed without great strength and inflexible courage, fortified by the firmest religious faith, by the consciousness of right, and by a sufficiency to stand alone.

Thus the ideal set forth by the prophet of the Hebrews was in some way realised—"And a man shall be as an hiding place from

the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land[1]."

Seldom has any man, on reaching the term of his existence, been able to look back at so complete an accomplishment of the destiny which he was sent into the world to fulfil. His life had been warped by no blighting forces, had been fettered or hindered by no injurious influences, but had proceeded from the first to its full developement and fruition.

> "That continuous state
> Of ordered impulse mariners await
> In some benignant and enriching wind,
> The breath ordained by Nature[2]."

His life had flowed from its source like the clear, free waters of a great river, with ever widening and deepening stream, till at length it joined the ocean.

> "O could I flow like thee, and make thy stream
> My great example, as it is my theme;
> Though deep, yet clear; though gentle, yet not dull;
> Strong without rage, without o'erflowing full[3]."

[1] Isaiah xxxii. 2.
[2] *Lines on the Duke of Wellington* by B. Disraeli.
[3] Denham, *Cooper's Hill*.

INDEX

A

Abbot, Archbishop, on the powers of physicians, iii 553
Abercromby, General James, H. disapproves of command given to, iii 198 *n.*; Joseph Yorke's opinion of, iii 198; failure at Fort Ticonderoga, iii 137, 198*n.*
Abjuration, Oath of, excludes Jews from H. of Commons, ii 129
Abney, Sir Thomas, judge, death from gaol fever, i 80
Abreu, Spanish minister in England, ii 250; Fox discusses project of exchanging Gibraltar for Minorca with, ii 305; note of and Pitt's reply to, iii 144; disavowed by Charles III of Spain, iii 151; correspondence, iii 122 *n.*
Acapulco, capture of galleon from, i 330
Acceptance, verbal, i 129
Accountant-General, order of H. defining charges of, ii 517
Acton, Catherine, *see* Gibbon, Catherine
Acton, Richard, i 34
Adams, —, opinion in the Lords against Lord Chancellor Henley's decree in *Drury* v. *Drury*, iii 389
Addington, Dr, attends Mrs Charles Yorke, ii 590; prescription of, ii 592
Adlington v. *Cann*, ii 427, 495, 505 *n.*
Aequitas sequitur legem, rule of, ii 437, 438, 450; limits of, ii 441–2
Affry, Louis, Count D', French ambassador at the Hague, Col. Yorke rejects paper of, iii 116 *n.*; George II's application to Vienna for terms communicated to, iii 173; Gen. Yorke's negotiations and interviews with, iii 145, 243; failure of, iii 145; describes Joseph Yorke to Choiseul, ii 152
Agent or trustee, notice to an, ii 448
Agreement, binding character of, even when made in supposition of a right which does not exist, ii 452
Aguesseau, D', Chancellor of France, note on, ii 170; complaints of his delays, ii 510 *n.*; conversation with Charles Yorke, ii 170, 488
Aiguillon, Duc d', negotiations with Lord Howe, iii 144
Aix-la-Chapelle, peace of, i 627 sqq., 632 sqq.; terms of, i 633; causes of the French making, i 654, ii 15, 21; results, i 633; begins a new period, ii 1
Albemarle, 2nd Earl of, note on, i 510, ii 167; at Fontenoy, i 404; praises Joseph Yorke's conduct at Fontenoy, ii 148; ambassador at Paris and neglects his duties, ii 149; absence from Paris, ii 150; death of, ii 256
Albemarle, George, 3rd Earl of (Lord Bury), note on, i 410; brings news of Culloden, i 521; victory at Havannah, iii 419
Allen, Ralph, of Prior Park, i 96; hospitality of, ii 196; his visitors, ii 144; Pitt, Charles Yorke and Warburton, iii 364; correspondence, iii 478
Alva, Duke of, maxim of, iii 247
Ambassadors, privileges of, i 140; cases concerning decided by H., ii 464; the Chancellor's and Chief Justices' jurisdiction over offenders against, ii 418
Ambler, Charles, *Reports*, ii 431 *n.*; tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 526
Amelia, Princess, chief mourner at Queen Caroline's funeral, i 182; attends Lord Lovat's trial, i 583, 585; on battle of Lauffeld, i 647; joins the D. of Cumberland's faction, ii 87 *n.*; cabals of, ii 39, 41, 44, 46, 47, 113, 114, 119 *n.*, 181; supporter of Fox, ii 188; refuses H. a key of Richmond Park, ii 46; suits against for closing Richmond Park, ii 308 *n.*; anxiety on the D. of Cumberland's account, iii 164, 181; conversation with H. on the Princess of Hesse, ii 222; disapproves of Bute's appointment to Groom of the Stole, ii 315; angry conversation with the Princess of Wales, ii 307; rage against Fox, iii 401; renewed friendship with N., H. on, iii 401, 433; on Bute's resumption of influence over George III, iii 508; correspondence, i 397, ii 395
Amelot, Jean Jacques, French Minister of State, i 269
America, taxation of, H. Pelham dissuaded from by H. and N., ii 8
Ames, Joseph, inscribes his *Typographical Antiquities* to H., ii 561
Amherst, Jeffrey, later Baron, note on, iii 198; merits urged by Col. Joseph Yorke, iii 114, 198, 237 sqq.; Wolfe's opinion of, iii 114 *n.*; account of the retreat to Stade, reference to, iii 119 *n.*;

advancement of, iii 113; at conquest of Cape Breton 1758, iii 137; campaign in Canada 1759, iii 138; on his victory at Montreal, iii 152, 247; correspondence, iii 247
Anabaptists at Dover, i 20
Ancaster, 3rd Duke of, Lord Chamberlain, at Cabinet Council, ii 191
Ancram, Lord (afterwards 4th Marquis of Lothian), wounded at Fontenoy, note on, i 393; pursues fugitives from Culloden, i 524
Andrews, Capt. of the "Defiance," killed in battle off Minorca, ii 293
Anesty, Richard de, lawsuit of, ii 74
Anglesey, Lord, decree of H. *in personam*, ii 461
Anglesey case, Lord Mansfield's conduct of, criticised, ii 512
Anhalt-Dessau, Prince Leopold of (Der Alte Dessauer), note on, iii 225
Anhalt-Zerbst, Dow.-Princess of, passion for intrigues, iii 22 *n.*, 65; correspondence with Joseph Yorke, iii 22, 65 sqq.
Animadversions upon the Recent Laws of England, ii 503
Annaly, Lord, *Reports* of, i 121 *n.*, ii 430, 432 *n.*
Anne, Queen, speech on accession, iii 262; grant from her civil list for the war, iii 246
Anne, Princess Royal, Princess of Orange, i 173 *n.*; Regent of the Netherlands, situation and character of, ii 32; meeting with the King, 1748, i 656; good relations of Joseph Yorke with, ii 152, 575; eulogy of H., ii 411; remonstrance on the attitude of England towards Holland, iii 232; begs for H.'s support and advice, iii 170; letter to H. appealing for assistance for the maintenance of the barrier, ii 37; gratitude to H. for support, iii 231; death of, iii 232; correspondence, i 638, 652, ii 395, iii 232
Anonymous letters to H., ii 208
Anson, George, Admiral, Lord, note on, i 346; about to start on his "voyage," i 245 and *n.*; return and letter to H. on, i 330, 346; procession of his men with the treasure taken, i 349; M.P. for Hedon, ii 156; advanced by H., ii 155; marriage to H.'s daughter, i 639 *n.*, 678; created Baron Anson, i 639 *n.*, ii 155; residences of, ii 158; Lord Sandwich leaves the direction of the Navy to, iii 114 *n.*; appointed President of the Board of Admiralty, ii 42; his great character and abilities, ii 156; famous naval administration of, ii 156, iii 114; naval reforms, creates the marines, ii 156; independence in naval matters, ii 310; resists solicitations, ii 157; distaste for correspondence, ii 157, 393; distaste for politics, ii 156–7; advice to Hawke to avoid councils of war, iii 286; "mistakes in manner" of, H. endeavours to rectify, iii 159; private generosity of, ii 157; victory off Cape Finisterre, i 625, 639; present at Cabinet Council at Henry Pelham's death, ii 191; to rebuke Legge for ridiculing N., ii 197 *n.*; urges organisation of the Colonies in their defence before outbreak of the war, ii 256 *n.*; raises the distinguished officers of the next generation, ii 157, iii 114; unfortunate choice of Byng, ii 157; responsibility for loss of Minorca, ii 268 sqq., 350 sqq.; advises N. to keep fleets in home waters, ii 268; eulogised by H. Walpole, ii 268; abused by Walpole, ii 269; abused by Pitt, ii 273, 351; complimented by Pitt, ii 289; management of the Navy censured by Pitt, ii 333; resignation of, ii 280; H.'s concern for, ii 334; H. takes the lead in organising defence of, ii 353 sqq.; defended by Lord Royston, ii 347, 351; reappointed First Lord of the Admiralty through H.'s influence, ii 370, 403, iii 114; Pitt and Bute concur in, ii 404; Lord Lyttelton's congratulations, ii 412; George II desires reinstatement of, ii 401, 403, 404; justification of, ii 353, 372, 405; House of Commons inquiry, ii 351; plans of adopted by Pitt on obtaining office, 1756, ii 362; conference with Legge, ii 391; recommends Wolfe for promotion, iii 114 *n.*; complaints of N.'s Admiralty appointments, iii 31; on the Army, iii 215; opposed to Pitt's policy of separate expeditions, iii 117 *n.*; thinks attempt against Rochefort practicable, iii 189; exercises the fleet, iii 217; on prospects at Louisburg, iii 216, 218; on Joseph Yorke, ii 151; sent on a mission to N. by H. on the affair of the "Inconnue," iii 87; opinion of doctors, ii 594; grief at loss of his wife, ii 580; produces a state of the fleet at Cabinet of August 24, 1761, iii 272; opposes declaration of war against Spain at meeting of Cabinet, October 2, 1761, iii 279; conquest of Havannah planned by, iii 295, 373, 418; Mrs Delany's praise of, ii 158 *n.*; testimonies to his merits, iii 259–60; H.'s character of, i 678, ii 157, iii 418; Pitt's tardy eulogy of, ii 352; correspondence, ii 163, 284, 293, 354, 357, 393, 403, 593, iii 87, 186, 215 sqq., 253
Anson, Lady, *see* Yorke, Lady Elizabeth
Anson, Thomas, i 425
Anstis, John, Garter, arranges procession of Lord High Steward, 1746, i 559 *n.*
Anstis, George, case of, ii 510
Antwerp, captured by the French, i 625
Antwerp Inn, at Dover, i 22, 23
Appeal in criminal cases discussed by H., i 128
Appius, Colonel of regiment of Hesse-Homburg, at Fontenoy, i 434
Appointment under a power, if for sinister purposes, void, ii 463

Arcot, Clive's victory of, ii 8
Aremberg, Duc D', note on obstructive conduct of, i 352; commands Austrian troops in Flanders, i 297, 330; opposes Lord Stair's project of march to Paris, i 354; proposes to attack the French army, i 361; dispute with Count Maurice of Nassau, i 343
Argenson, Comte D', note on, ii 166; proposals for peace, i 627, 636
Argyll, John Campbell, 2nd Duke of, i 163, 165, 179; goes into opposition, i 183; criticises the army, i 198; attack on Walpole, i 200; supports Bill for Walpole's impeachment, i 289, 290; opposes Bill of penalties for the Porteous riots, passage of arms with H., i 183; esteem for H., i 183; Jacobite attempt to seduce, i 304; note on, made commander-in-chief, i 304; connection with Lord Carteret, i 305; and Convention of Hanau, i 323
Argyll, 3rd Duke of (Lord Islay), i 264, 305; intrigues against H. and N., i 192; opposes Bill of penalties for Porteous riots, i 183; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 333; condemns apathy shown in Scotland, 1745, i 460; acquiesces in abolition of hereditary jurisdictions, i 591–2; speech in support of abolition, i 595, 613–4; supports Act restricting exercise of functions of Anglican Church in Scotland, i 599; on entails, i 624; complimented by Lord Lovat, i 586; presides at trial of James of the Glen, i 557; present at Cabinet Council on Henry Pelham's death, ii 191; commissioned to gain over Bute from opposition, ii 304; promotes Pitt's scheme of raising Highland regiments, ii 384; resentment at nomination of Lord Eglinton to governorship of Dumbarton Castle pacified by H., iii 108
Argyll, 4th Duke of, does not support Hereditary Jurisdictions Scotland Bill, i 606
Argyll, 5th Duke of (Jack Campbell) votes against the Hereditary Jurisdictions Scotland Bill, i 606
Armada newsletters, i 212
Armitage, Ex parte, ii 465
Army, standing, in time of peace, i 148; fears of, i 97; a defence of the constitution, ii 54; employment of to quell disturbances, i 135; justified by H., i 184; instructions for quelling riots, i 93; civil control of insisted upon by H., i 198; discipline, i 92; Mutiny Bill, 1749, ii 84 sqq.; extended to India, ii 142; death penalty for desertion, ii 54; courts-martial, futility of proceedings of, ii 341–2; revision of articles of war, ii 341, 358; revisal of sentences, ii 54, 85; supported by H., ii 54; liability to court-martial of officers on half-pay, ii 54, 84, 88; liability of ex-officers to, iii 140 *n.*; Bacon on necessity of armed national force, ii 262; Militia Bills, ii 261 sqq.; impressments for military service, iii 2 sqq.; Act 29 George II, c. 4, iii 3; serious infringement of the liberty of the subject by, iii 3, 4; relief against illegal imprisonments, iii 2 sqq.; H. on the officers, iii 190; Lord Anson on the officers, iii 215–6; emigration of discharged soldiers to Nova Scotia, ii 53; numbers of, 1755, ii 273 *n.*; 1759, iii 137; 1760, iii 152; estimate of expenditure on, 1761, iii 249
"Army of observation," iii 119
Arne, Edward, i 79
Artis, Samuel, defendant, i 136
Asgill, John, note on case of, iii 502
Ashburnham, John, 2nd Earl of, on Anson's reinstatement at the Admiralty, ii 370 *n.*; advises N. to retire from office at George III's accession, iii 307
Assiento, confirmed by Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, i 633
Athenian Letters, i 207
Atholl, James, 2nd Duke of, i 437 *n.*; vassals refuse to drink health of, i 616
Atkyns, John Tracy, *Reports* of, refused leave to publish by H., ii 431 *n.*; argument in *Omychund* v. *Barker*, ii 457; tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 526
Atterbury, Bishop, banishment of, i 74
Attorney-General v. *Montgomery*, ii 516 *n.*
Augusta, Princess, daughter of Frederick Prince of Wales, birth of, i 170; marriage to the hereditary Prince of Brunswick, iii 369; obstruction of, iii 400
Augustus, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, i 266, 350 *n.*; attitude of, i 359
Augustus, Fort, captured by the rebels, 1746, i 511
Austria, relations with Great Britain, i 318, 321, 337, 339, 386, 632, 659 sqq., 674, ii 2 sqq., 255, 285; Treaty of Vienna, 1732, ii 30; subsidy to, 1745, i 382; demand for £100,000, 1748, i 683, ii 10 sqq.; indifference regarding election of the King of the Romans, ii 33; accession of England to treaty with Russia and Austria, H. and N. on, ii 23; end of Austrian alliance, ii 3; treaty with France, i 674, ii 274; league with France and Russia against Frederick, iii 116, 127; forces opposed to Frederick, 1758, iii 203; position of, 1758, iii 196; Bute's negotiation with censured by H., results of, iii 296

B

Bacon, Sir Edmund, M.P., i 136
Bacon, Francis, Viscount St Albans, on legislation, i 595; on idleness of warlike peoples, ii 264; on necessity of a national armed force, ii 262; on the separation of the equity and common law jurisdictions, ii 511, 553; on the encroachment

of equity upon the common law, ii 554; dictum that not a decision but its ground is to be regarded, ii 424; picture of a great judge, ii 525; on "affectation of despatch" in judges, ii 509; on importance of publicity in administration of justice, ii 522 *n.*
Bagshaw v. *Spencer*, ii 515; supposed dictum of H. in, ii 432
Bailiff of Ilchester v. *Bendishe*, ii 428
Balance of power in Europe, necessity of for British interests, i 293
Ball, Thomas, murder of, i 92
Balmerino, 6th Baron, note on, i 168, 570; trial of, i 559; statement on supposed Jacobite order to give no quarter at Culloden, i 532 *n.*; execution of, i 576
Bambridge, Thomas, prosecution of, i 79
Bank of England, run upon, Sept. 1745, i 417, 460, 463, 503
Bankruptcy Act, 5 George II, opposed by H., i 98
Bankruptcy, laws, H.'s disapproval of, ii 546; fraudulent, made felony by statute, i 131
Baptism, slaves not enfranchised by, ii 472–3
Bar, the, as a profession, H. on, ii 527, iii 416; Lord Chesterfield on, ii 527 *n.*; H.'s intimate and confidential relations with, ii 439; influence on the Bench of professional opinion of, ii 439; professional etiquette, i 109; members of, duties in presenting cases to the Court, duties towards clients, i 142; principal defenders of the Constitution, i 141; loyal address to George II in 1745, i 420
Barisdales, the two, movements after Culloden, i 542
Barker v. *Dixie*, i 126 *n.*
Barnard, Lord, on Fox, ii 188
Barnardiston, Thomas, *Cases in Chancery*, ii 432 *n.*; tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 526 *n.*
Barnsley v. *Powell*, ii 476
Barons' Courts in Scotland, jurisdiction of, retained, i 595, 610
Barré, Col. Isaac, note on, iii 340; brings Amherst's despatches from Montreal, iii 247; attacks the late King George II, iii 339; attacks Pitt in the House of Commons, iii 340
Barret v. *Lun*, ii 463
Barrier, the, in the Netherlands, maintenance of, i 665, ii 21; demand upon England for, ii 38; denounced by H., ii 6; towns, i 308; Treaty of 1716, i 386, 439 *n.*
Barrington, Daines, on developement in equity under H., ii 494; on despatch of business in the Court of Chancery, ii 505, 516 *n.*
Barrington, Col. John, letter of Joseph Yorke to, i 646
Barrington, William, 2nd Viscount, note on, ii 355; appointed Secretary at War, ii 198, 370; N.'s supposed messages to, ii 319, 321; defends late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 359; censures Byng, ii 272 *n.*; Gen. Blakeney's conversation with, ii 354; on Fox's desertion of the ministers, 1706, ii 276; on N.'s retention of influence after resignation, 1756, ii 361; conversation with George II on N., ii 388; on N.'s "call to Government" at George III's accession, iii 261; paper on supply for the war, iii 353; Treasurer of the Navy, relations with N. after the latter's retirement, iii 376 *n.*, 405 *n.*; Chancellor of the Exchequer, iii 266; on Pitt as necessary to any opposition, iii 363; correspondence, iii 125
Barrymore, Lord, Jacobite, i 304; arrest of, i 529 *n.*; implicated in the Rebellion, i 582
Basilicon Doron, i 590
Baskett v. *University of Cambridge*, ii 438
Bassett, Ferdinando, i 22
Bassett, Mary, of Hythe, i 21
Bath, William Pulteney, Earl of, note on, i 73, 252; ballad of, i 82; withdraws from Parliament, i 190; treasonable letter to Admiral Vernon, i 196; attack on Walpole, i 99; speaks in support of motion for Walpole's removal, i 253; admiration for Walpole, ii 168; overtures of ministers to, 1742, i 318; H.'s interview with, i 298; Lord Orford warns the Pelhams against, i 340; fails to secure chief power, i 281, 337 *n.*; explains his failure, i 279; obtains peerage, i 280; supports grant for Hanoverian troops in the Cabinet, i 292, 293; refuses support to Government, 1745, i 418; does not sign proclamation setting price on the head of the Young Pretender, i 436; advises the King to reject ministerial policy, i 427; offers to take the Government, i 503; First Commissioner of the Treasury, i 499; failure to regain power, i 429; minister of 40 hours, i 426; supports a complaint of Lord Lovat at his trial, i 574, 578, 582; proposal on the Mutiny Bill, ii 86; brings forward marriage case of *Cochrane* v. *Campbell*, ii 60; attachment to H., ii 220; civilities to Charles Yorke and conversation, ii 168; received by Louis XV, ii 170; hostility to Fox, ii 188 *n.*; indignation at attack upon H. in the *Monitor*, ii 384; supports Bute's violent measures, Pitt on, iii 430; and Charles Yorke's succession to the Great Seal, 1762, iii 410; correspondence, i 77, ii 220, 336, 546
Bath, Countess of, i 429
Bath, Pitt refuses to convey address of, congratulating the King on the Peace, and resigns his seat, iii 384

Bathurst, Hon. Henry, opinion in the Lords against Lord Chancellor Henley's decree in *Drury* v. *Drury*, iii 389
Batthyani, Marshal, note on, i 640; General of the allied army, i 627; at battle of Lauffeld, i 641 sqq.; fails to support the D. of Cumberland, i 644, 648–9
Bavaria, abandons alliance with France, i 388; makes peace with Austria, i 626; British treaty with and subsidy, ii 3, 26
Baylis, rioter, i 132
Beardmore, attorney for Wilkes, H. on, iii 500
Beaufort, 4th Duke of, Jacobitism overlooked, i 537; speaks against the Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 613
Beaumer, Mme de, *nom-de-guerre* of the Dowager-Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst, iii 22
Beauséjour, fort, captured from the French, ii 284, 258
Beckford, William, the elder, note on, iii 5; opposes Bill for increasing the judges' salaries, iii 20; abuses the Lords, iii 18; Pitt on importance and dignity of, iii 18; Pitt's strange eulogy of in the House of Commons, iii 28; speaks in the debate on the Address, Nov. 1761, iii 338; organizes Pitt's triumphal entry into the city, 1761, iii 281; dislike by the Whigs of, iii 436; attention in the House of Commons to, iii 438; Lord Mayor of London, arranges interview between Bute and Pitt, Aug. 1763, iii 525
Beckford, W., the younger, suit against Princess Amelia, ii 308 *n.*
Beckford v. *Tobin*, ii 466
Bedchamber, Lords of the, increase of by Bute, iii 378
Bedford, John, 4th Duke of, character of, i 630; said to be hen-pecked, ii 137; supposed Jacobitism of, i 529 *n.*, ii 47; opposes Treason Act, 1744, i 327; raises regiment in 1745, i 456; resigns 1746, i 499; Secretary of State, 1748, i 629; character and conduct as Minister, i 661, 664, ii 39, 98; impracticability of, ii 102; opposes naval expedition to Nova Scotia, ii 8; plays up to George II's prejudices against Prussia, ii 87; disliked by George II, ii 87; despised by the Duke of Grafton, ii 110; N.'s jealousy of, ii 39; retirement insisted upon by N., ii 93 sqq.; resignation of, 1751, ii 40, 98 sqq., 112 sqq.; complains to George II of N., ii 113, 116; overtures to Lord Granville, ii 114; goes into opposition, ii 41 sqq.; factious conduct of, i 199, ii 91; joins the Duke of Cumberland's faction, ii 85 sqq.; attack on the Government, 1753, ii 47; called to order by H., ii 48; opposes Jews Naturalisation Bill, ii 55; attempt to repeal Act giving Jews naturalisation in the Colonies, ii 57; attacks Marriage Act, ii 61, 67; Shebbeare's *The Marriage Act* dedicated to, ii 63, 137; supporter of Fox, ii 188; communications with Fox, 1755, ii 275; supports the administration, ii 252; patron of the Militia Act, ii 262, iii 37; Fox negotiates with, 1756, ii 333; included in the Fox-Waldegrave administration, ii 368, 389, 399–400; Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 1757, ii 370; extravagant grant of Irish pensions to his dependents, ii 51; summoned to town at the Hanoverian crisis, iii 166; advises N. to remain in office at George III's accession, iii 261, 307; supports N. and H. in the Cabinet against Pitt, iii 321; peace policy of, iii 399; against the overloading of England with "foreign" Colonies, iii 287; Lord Privy Seal, Nov. 1761, iii 292; motion in the Lords for the withdrawal from the Continental war, 1762, iii 301; conversation with N., July 1762, iii 406; attitude towards George Grenville's administration, iii 498; urges George III to summon Pitt to office, iii 471; advises Bute to include the Whig Lords in the Administration, 1763, iii 386 *n.*; negotiations with Pitt, iii 532; rejects proposals for return to office, iii 469; Pitt's opinion of as a Minister, iii 506, 530; informed of Pitt's refusal to admit him into his Administration, iii 471; takes office as President of the Council, 1763, iii 471; correspondence, ii 271 *n.*, 342 *n.*, 362, 408 *n.*
Bedford, Duchess of, pushes the D. of B. into cabals, ii 85
Bedford v. *Coke*, ii 425
Bedingfeld, Sir Henry, assurances of protection from H., i 464
Beeston, Mr Justice, recommended by the Duchess of Marlborough, i 275
Behr, M., despatched with the news of the Battle of Hastenbeck, iii 161
Belcher, Jonathan, Governor of New Jersey, correspondence with H., ii 27–9; imputations upon his administration, advises attack upon Quebec, 1755, ii 27–9; repudiates charges against him, ii 29
Bell, John, H.'s censure of the conduct of the trial of, ii 433; H. dissuades Sir Michael Foster from publishing, ii 434
Belleisle, Marshal, note on, i 302, 390; a prisoner, i 407; plan of invading England, 1756, ii 285 sqq.
Belleisle, Comte de, i 390 *n.*
Belleisle, expedition to, debate in the Cabinet Council on, iii 311; tactical error of, N., Walpole, and Frederick of Prussia on, iii 117 *n.*, 283; Gen. Yorke on, iii 267; opposition to by H. and N. and the Admirals, iii 252–3, 267; success and cost of, iii 267; Hawke's victory off, i 625

Bellow, on the Chancellor's equity jurisdiction, ii 444
Belt, R., *Reports*, ii 431 *n.*
Beneficiaries and trustees, H. on relations between, ii 468
Benefit of clergy, i 131
Bennett and Spencer v. *Wade*, ii 60
Bentham, Jeremy, the elder, account of H., i 64, 93, 97, 118 *n.*; tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 527
Bentinck, Count William, joins Sandwich in dispute with N., i 663 sqq.; correspondence, i 632
Bergen, Prince Ferdinand's reverse at, iii 139
Bergen-op-Zoom, Joseph Yorke's account of siege of, i 651; capture of by the French, i 627
Berkeley, Lieut. Harry, killed at Fontenoy, i 393, 409
Berkeley, John, 5th Lord Berkeley of Stratton, speaks in support of Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 613
Berlin, occupied by the Russians and Austrians and relieved by Frederick, iii 153; Gen. Yorke's impressions of, iii 228
Bernstorff, Baron John, note on, i 390, 491
Bertie, Lord Robert, on Byng's Council of War, ii 292
Best, Dorothy, *see* Gibbon, Dorothy
Bevern, Prince of, *see* Brunswick-Bevern, Duke of
Billingsley, Mrs Elizabeth, *see* Yorke, Elizabeth
Billingsley, Sir Henry, Lord Mayor of London, i 37
Billingsley, Rev. John the elder, i 37
Billingsley, Rev. John the younger, i 37
Billingsley, Rev. John, i 36–8
Billingsley, Mary (Mrs), i 36
Billingsley, Mary, *see* Fothergill, Mary
Billingsley, Rev Philip, i 36
Billingsley, Philip, Clerk of the Briefs, appointed to the Chaff Wax, ii 118
Billingsley, Roger, of Canterbury, i 37
Birch, Rev. Thomas, advanced by H., ii 560; contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 207; aided by the 2nd Lord H. in his literary work, ii 146; inscription to H. of the *Thurloe Papers*, ii 561; witnesses execution of Lords Kilmarnock and Balmerino, i 576; account of H.'s speech on Marriage Bill, ii 67; and on Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 14; correspondence, i 276, 349, 435, 450, 455, 457, 459, 552, 575, 666, ii 124, 131 sqq., 142, 146, iii 114, 388 sqq., 431, 509
Bird, Martin, excuse for not joining the Militia, ii 266
Bishop, Sir Cecil, i 242
Black Act, i 135
Black Friday, i 424
Blackstone, Sir William, disapproval of the Marriage Act, ii 61; on equity, ii 421; contradictory definitions of, ii 444; on judicial procedure in granting writ of habeas corpus, iii 2 *n.*; application to Charles Yorke for information, ii 572 *n.*
Blackwell, T., letter of, i 618
Blackwood v. *Harper*, ii 464
Blair Castle, siege of, i 517
Blakeney, William, Lord, note on, i 495, 257; opposes storming of Fort St Lazarus, i 256 and *n.*; defence of Minorca, ii 305 sqq., 341; evidence against Byng, ii 270, 355, 380
Bland, Major-General Humphrey, note on, i 246, 471; commands in campaign against the Rebels, i 510, 516, 541; at Culloden, i 523; pursues fugitives, i 524; in charge of Lord Lovat, i 549; on necessity of reforming Scotland by Englishmen, i 622 *n.*; wounded at battle of Lauffeld, i 643; marriage of, i 622 *n.*; correspondence, i 616, 622
Bland, Sir J., interpretation of will of, ii 499
Blasphemy, prosecution for, i 80
Blount family, estate of acquired by Charles Yorke by his first marriage, ii 574
Bobart, gardener at Blenheim, i 224
Boetzlaar, Dutch envoy in London, i 355
Bohemia, plainness of the inhabitants, iii 210
Bolingbroke, Henry St John, 1st Viscount, *Letter from the Hague*, i 84; negotiations with the Government in 1717, i 368; client of, and acquaintance with, H., i 96; obligations to H., i 310; admiration of H., i 97; hopes to gain H. from Walpole, i 192; attack on Walpole, i 99; protest of Minority in the Lords on Walpole's removal said to be written by, i 253; renews acquaintance with H., i 377; visits to H., i 341; renewed ambitions, 1744, i 378; on affairs at the French Court, i 356; conversation with H. on public affairs, i 377; offers of services to the Government, i 377; proposes mission of Silhouette, i 392; warns H. of domestic intrigues, i 391; sends his writings to H., i 362, 367; grounds of defence of the Peace of Utrecht, iii 391; respects "evangelical religion," i 368; cessation of communications with H., i 378; joins Leicester House faction, i 378; characterised by Frederick Prince of Wales, i 378; H. rejects a candidate for holy orders from, ii 560; George III educated on his principles, ii 45, iii 256; correspondence, i 115, 310, 341, 355, 362, 367, 391
Bolingbroke, Lady, correspondence with Marshal de Noailles, i 409 *n.*
Bolton, 1st Duke of, note on, saying of, i 380
Bolton, Robert, dean of Carlisle, i 299
Bonnac, Chevalier de, marriage of, ii 154
Bootle, Sir Thomas, i 84

Bor v. *Jacob Bor*, ii 483
Boscawen, Admiral Edward, brought forward by Anson, iii 114; failure of expedition against Pondicherry, i 627; failure of attack upon French fleet, ii 257, 284, 350; captures the "Aquilon," ii 295; a Lord of the Admiralty, ii 404 *n.*; at conquest of Cape Breton, iii 137; victory off Lagos, iii 138; opposes Pitt's expedition to Belleisle, iii 267
Boscawen, Col., claims to promotion, ii 171
Boteler v. *Allington*, ii 495
Bothmar, Count Hans v., note on, iii 67
Boufflers, Duc de, i 438
Bourn, Richard, case of, iii 10
Boyd, Sir Robert, note on, ii 353; at battle of Wilhelmsthal, iii 399
Boyle, Hon. Henry, Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer and Speaker of the H. of Commons, great influence of, ii 49; dismissed, ii 50; created Earl of Shannon and given a pension, ii 51
Brace v. *Taylor*, ii 516
Bracton, repudiation of as legal authority, ii 486
Braddock, General, military character of, commands American expedition, ii 257; defeat and death of at Fort Duquesne, ii 258; conduct of, ii 285 *n.*; George II's comments upon, ii 285; last words of, ii 258
Bradley, Rev. James, the astronomer, H. supports claims to promotion of, ii 561
Bradley v. ——, ii 495
Bradshaw, James, deposition of, i 533 *n.*
Brady, Dr, i 226
Brand, Sir Thomas, on H.'s Scottish legislation, i 601 *n.*
Brandenburg, plainness of the inhabitants, iii 210
Brandenburg-Schwedt, Margrave Karl of, Gen. Yorke's account of, note on, iii 226
Brawling in church, i 124 *n.*
Breadalbane, 2nd Earl of, i 498; note by Sir W. Scott on, i 210 *n.*; conversation with the Young Pretender at Holyrood, i 456, 470
Breadalbane, John Campbell, 3rd Earl of (Lord Glenorchy), i 209; urged by H. to take active measures in Scotland against the Rebels, i 437; useful services of, i 421; difficult situation of, i 452–3; unable to supply troops to Cope, i 442, 445; takes measures for restraining his clan, i 446, 465, 477; raises Highlanders against the Rebels, i 493; on Scottish reforms, i 604; recommendation of Campbell of Glenure, i 557; on necessity of allowing the kilt and their own officers to the Highlanders enlisted, iii 30; succeeds to earldom, ii 124 *n.*; representative peer of Scotland, i 554, ii 118 *n.*; ill-treated by the King, i 531, 553 sqq., ii 118; cause of, i 555; hostile influence of D. of Cumberland, ii 47; Pitt's treatment of, iii 315 *n.*; correspondence, i 236, 445, 446, 465, 477, 493, 513, 518, 538, 545, 549, 604, ii 124, iii 30
Breslau, Peace of, i 293, 319
Breton, Cape, capture of, 1745, i 433, 625; surrendered by Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, i 631, 633; reconquest of, iii 137
Brett, Capt. Percy, engages the "Elizabeth," i 434, 437
Bribery, bond given to procure a recommendation to a military appointment cancelled by H., ii 474; covered by privilege of the peerage, iii 493
Brignolé, Mme de, Duc de Richelieu's letter to, ii 304
Bristol, George, 2nd Earl of, Wall's warning to concerning England's neglect of Spain, iii 143; despatches and instructions of, iii 151, 274, 293 sqq.
Bristol, turnpike riots near, i 92
British Museum, foundation of, ii 558; H. presides at meetings of, ii 298
Broad Bottom, the, i 336
Broad Bottom Ministry, i 373, 379; treatment by the King, i 418; resignation of, i 426, 498 sqq.; reception of news by the army, i 506; reinstated, i 427, 505 sqq.; memorandum to the King, i 428; increased power, i 430
Broadley, Mr, of Dover, ii 164
Brook v. *Gally*, ii 467
Brougham, Lord, on Lord Eldon's judicial methods, ii 500 *n.*; inattention to the arguments of Counsel, ii 525
Broughton, John, pugilist, said to have attended Bute as a guard, iii 432
Brown, Charles, Commodore, note on, i 223
Brown, William, mayor of Great Yarmouth, defendant, i 136
Browne, J. Hawkins, verses in praise of H., ii 496; eulogy of H.'s sons, ii 578
Brühl, Count Heinrich v., Polish and Saxon Minister of State, correspondence with Count Fleming, ii 21
Brunswick, Charles, Duke of Wolfenbüttel, note on, i 643; leaves the D. of Cumberland's army in disgust, iii 167; treaty with France and surrender, iii 122
Brunswick, Charles William, Hereditary Prince, afterwards Duke of, distinguishes himself at Hastenbeck, iii 161; pursuit of the French after Minden, iii 234; brings reinforcement to Frederick, iii 142; defeat at Corbach and Campen and success at Emsdorf, iii 153; marriage to Princess Augusta of England obstructed, iii 400; ill-treatment of on his visit to England, iii 369
Brunswick, Prince Ferdinand of, commander-in-chief of the troops in Germany, iii 125; advised and commended by Frederick of Prussia, iii 207; operations of 1758, iii 126; victory of at Crefeld, iii 126; obnoxious to the Princess of Wales, iii 140; opposition of Leicester House

to support of in Germany, iii 118; Lord George Sackville's cabals against, iii 245; private correspondence with Pitt, iii 87; reverse at Bergen, iii 139; George II's reflections upon, iii 230; victory at Minden, iii 139, 233; on Lord George Sackville at Minden, iii 139; Lord G. Sackville on his treatment by, iii 235; H. urges the Garter for, iii 234; British reinforcements for, iii 216; military operations of 1760, iii 152; Pitt demands a battle of, iii 247; victory at Warburg, iii 153; campaign of 1761, iii 267; strength of his army 1762, iii 397–8; victory at Wilhelmsthal, iii 368; reception of the news in England, iii 398–9; conduct of Bute towards, iii 369, 400; meritorious conduct under Bute's ill-treatment, iii 400; neglected and insulted by George III, iii 258

Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Sophia, Princess of, projected marriage with George P. of Wales rejected by him, ii 200

Brunswick, Prince Louis, negotiations with France, iii 25, 92, 144; Gen. Yorke excluded from, iii 80, 97; instructed to include Joseph Yorke, iii 26; negotiation with Austria 1761, iii 296

Brunswick-Bevern, August Wilhelm, Duke of, note on, Gen. Yorke's account of, iii 227

Brunswick, occupied by the French, iii 119

Brussels, surrender of, i 508, 625

Brydges, Edward, i 34

Brydges, Jane, i 32, 34

Brydges, Jemima, i 34

Brydges, John, i 32, 34

Brydges, John, of Gray's Inn, i 57

Brydges, Sir Samuel Egerton, i 32, 34

Buckingham, Katherine, Duchess of, letter to H., i 112

Buckley, Lord, i 66

Buller, Mr Justice, remarks on *Snee* v. *Prescott*, ii 493 *n.*

Buller, Margaret, i 69

Burke, Edmund, on the opposition to Walpole, i 189 *n.*; on pity for the defeated rebels, i 533; on Mansfield's introduction of equity into the common law, ii 512; on importance of publicity in the administration of justice, ii 522 *n.*; on the hearing of *Omychund* v. *Barker*, ii 460; on H.'s greatness, ii 529; on George II, iii 156; on situation of the Whig Lords at accession of George III, iii 361

Burkersdorf, Austrian defeat at, iii 368

Burnet, Bishop Gilbert, *History of His Own Times*, annotated by the 2nd Lord H., ii 146; H.'s charitable protection of family of, ii 561

Burnet, Sir Thomas, *Chesterfield* v. *Janssen* heard before, ii 453; submits his argument to H. before pronouncing it in Court, ii 419

Burnett, G., application for pardon of John Burnett, i 549

Burnett, John, of Campfield, note on, i 549

Burning alive, punishment of, i 131

Burroughs, Samuel, author of the *History of the Chancery*, i 94

Busch, Hanoverian agent, i 658

Bussy, François de, French agent and traitor, (101), note on, iii 268, i 245, 269, 305; reveals to N. (1740) treaties between France and Spain, i 245; negotiations in England, 1761, iii 268 sqq.; Choiseul's instructions and correspondence with, iii 270, 282; memorial of, iii 276

Bute, John, 3rd Earl of, character and abilities, iii 257; spelling ridiculed by Wilkes, iii 263 *n.*; character by Lord Waldegrave, ii 200 *n.*; D. of Devonshire's unfavourable opinion of, iii 429; said to have been brought into the P. of Wales's service by the Princess, ii 252; supposed criminal intimacy with the Princess, ii 200; gains ascendancy at Leicester House, ii 250 *n.*, 251; promotes hostility of George Prince of Wales against the government, ii 200; intrigues against the administration, ii 252; H. wishes N. could "come at him," ii 251; project to gain over from opposition, ii 304; proposal of the K. for an address from Parliament praying for his removal from the Princess of Wales, ii 254; Princess of Wales's improper zeal in advancing, ii 307; N. pressed to acquiesce in advancement of, ii 305; appointment as Groom of the Stole pressed by the P. and Princess of Wales, ii 200, 296; appointed, ii 275, 314; H.'s disapproval of, ii 310; surprised at Pitt's "meanness," ii 277 *n.*; gives support to Pitt in framing administration of 1756, ii 280; conferences with, ii 367, 398; approves of Anson's reinstatement, ii 404; conduct of in the negotiations for the new ministry praised by H., ii 406 *n.*; obligations to H. for effecting the settlement of the administration, ii 406; attitude towards Pitt and the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 50–2; censures Pitt's overbearing temper, iii 54; patronage of Lord George Sackville, ii 384, iii 118; correspondence with Lord George Sackville, iii 140; threatens Pitt on Lord George Sackville's account, iii 140; opposes support of Prince Ferdinand, iii 118; responsibility for disastrous expeditions to St Malo and Cherbourg, iii 118; presses N.'s retention of office at George III's accession in the King's name and gives assurances of support, iii 261, 306–7; conferences and agreement with Pitt at George III's accession, N.'s jealousy of, iii 305, 310; presses H. to take the Presidency of the Council, iii 259; George III conducts all business through, iii 262, 304; George III identifies himself with, H. on,

iii 264; bad influence upon George III, iii 256; declares George III's intentions, iii 310; advised by Pitt not to take the government, iii 431; plans for getting rid of N. and Pitt, iii 259; Bubb Dodington on, iii 259; intrigues of, iii 311; plays off Pitt against N., iii 260 sqq.; makes Tory appointments in concert with Pitt, iii 265; alliance with N. against Pitt, H.'s warning thereon, iii 266; intrigue to obtain appointment of Secretary of State, iii 265; appointment of as Secretary of State, Pitt's retaliation for, iii 317; Pitt declares his disapproval of, iii 431; supports Pitt's expedition to Belleisle, iii 311; supports Pitt's despatch of Aug. 15, 1761, iii 272; concurs in the rupture of negotiations with France, iii 274; opposes Pitt and the declaration of war against Spain, iii 323; speeches in the Cabinet, iii 278, 325; on Pitt's resignation, iii 288 *n.*, 326; ascendency of established by Pitt's resignation, iii 291; opposition to appointment of H. as Lord Privy Seal, N.'s indignation at, iii 328; engages pamphleteers in his support, iii 291; visit and compliments to H., iii 330, 333; on his own situation, iii 331; conversation with N., iii 333; "breathes war" to acquire popularity, iii 294, 335 sqq.; reproaches N. for his pacific disposition, iii 337; war policy of, iii 357–8; his Militia Bill for Scotland, H.'s displeasure at, iii 346; additions to the King's speech, Nov. 6, 1761, iii 294, 311; complains of N., iii 331; desire to withdraw from Germany, N. on motives of, iii 333–4; hesitates to renew Frederick's subsidy, iii 301, 343 sqq.; Charles Yorke on, iii 352; opposes motion in the Lords for the withdrawal from the continental war, iii 301; insists on cancellation of Article IV, iii 300; enraged with the Prussian ministers, iii 342; N.'s appeal to not to abandon the German war, iii 342; conversations with H., iii 300–1; H. reasons with against withdrawing the Prussian subsidy, iii 346, 348 sqq.; fatal policy of separation from Prussia, Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 358, 400; Sir J. Yorke's letter to, urging ill effects of, iii 341; refuses the Prussian subsidy, iii 302, 352; conduct of in separating England and Prussia, iii 299; reasons of, iii 295 sqq.; determination to make peace at all costs, motives of, iii 295; N. on, iii 355; opposes N. in the Treasury, iii 353, 356; interview with N., iii 356; acquiesces readily in N.'s resignation, iii 357; conference with the D. of Devonshire and Mansfield on N.'s resignation, iii 357; triumph of, 1st Lord of the Treasury and K.G., iii 360; his consequent unhappiness, iii 260; on his own situation, iii 392 sqq.; endeavours to gain the Whig leaders to support the Peace, iii 369; conference with H., iii 392, 395–6; overtures to H. and N., iii 404; thanks H. for opposing the production of the war accounts in the Lords, iii 455; treatment of H.'s family, iii 367; on Charles Yorke's surrender of his "just pretensions," iii 366; repudiates intention of dismissing Sir Joseph Yorke, iii 381, 392; relations with Pitt, iii 431; Pitt's declaration against, iii 430; D. of Cumberland's hostility to, iii 418; tries to gain the D. of Cumberland with offer of command of the Army, iii 423; negotiation with France, iii 358; manner of conducting the negotiations, iii 293, 418; H.'s interview with on negotiations for peace, iii 402 sqq.; conversation with the D. of Devonshire, iii 406; conversation with Charles Yorke, iii 410; embarrassed by the British successes, iii 368; and by the conquest of Havannah, iii 419; peace policy opposed by the rest of the Council, iii 406; outvoted in the Council on the question of demanding compensation for Havannah, iii 418; weakness of his situation, Fox on, iii 419; negotiation with Austria, Frederick's indignation at, Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 347, 359; H.'s disapproval of, results of, iii 296; interview with Prince Galitzin, Frederick's indignation at, iii 296; hostility to and ill-treatment of Prince Ferdinand, iii 369, 400; letters to Choiseul urging a strong resistance against Prince Ferdinand's army, iii 369; treatment of Frederick in the Peace of Paris, iii 373; "copies the Treaty of Utrecht throughout," iii 368, 419; sacrifice of great opportunities, N. on, iii 406; alliance with Fox, iii 292; conditions of, iii 336; George III on, iii 370; comments of H., D. of Cumberland; Fox, Duke of Devonshire and N. on, iii 422 sqq.; new system of intimidation and corruption, iii 370 sqq.; on Fox, iii 388; bribery of, iii 378; proscription of N.'s supporters, iii 377, 440 sqq.; D. of Cumberland on, the late Speaker Onslow consulted on, iii 446; "reign of terror," iii 378; Cider Bill, iii 381; endeavours to avoid the address from the City against by promising its repeal, iii 456; urged by the D. of Bedford and Charles Yorke to include the Whig Lords in the administration, iii 386; declaration of the K. proscribing the Whigs, iii 388; emblems of (and of the Princess of Wales) burnt by the mob, iii 461; Lord Mansfield talks slightingly of, iii 400; on Lord Mansfield, iii 325; unpopularity as a Scotsman, Charles Yorke on, iii 409; Surrey gentlemen refuse to drink his health, iii 383, 407; cold reception of at the Guildhall, iii 383; hostile reception in the City, iii 432; assaults upon, iii 281, 383; hanged

in effigy at Exeter, iii 515; frightened at the attacks upon him in the *North Briton*, iii 384; indecent reflexions on (and the Princess of Wales) in the *North Briton*, iii 459; Queen Charlotte's supposed influence employed against, iii 494; loses George III's confidence, iii 384; ill-health of, iii 457, 494; unhappiness of, iii 384; wishes to have his Gold Key again, iii 419, 420; fall of, iii 383 sqq.; resignation of, iii 385; causes of, iii 493; conversation on his resignation with Charles Yorke, iii 385; Lords Halifax and Egremont's account of, iii 457; distributes rewards to his supporters, iii 385; retires to Harrogate, iii 385; H. on conduct of, iii 457–8, 504; arranges the ministry which succeeds him, iii 388; remains minister behind the curtain, iii 385, 494, 497; repudiates intention of, iii 386; resumes influence over George III, iii 508; undertakes to arrange a new government, iii 468; overtures to the opposition on his return, iii 503; relations with Pitt, iii 469, 472; makes proposals to Pitt for his return to office which are rejected, iii 468, 509; visits Pitt with offer from George III, iii 469, 523, 525; conduct of in the negotiation, iii 529, 530, 537; object of, iii 530; alarmed at Pitt's plan of ministry and opposes, iii 470; Pitt's relations with, H. and D. of Cumberland on, iii 530, 532; George Grenville shakes off influence of, iii 467; banishment of, iii 470, 528; resigns the Privy Purse, iii 471; failure of appeal case, ii 524; correspondence, ii 406, iii 50 *n.*, 287, 347 *n.*, 370 *n.*, 380, 398

Butler, Charles, tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 504, 529; on the faint criticisms of H.'s decrees, ii 493

Butler, Jack, proscription of as a supporter of N., iii 442

Butler, James, i 242–3

Butler v. *Freeman*, ii 469

Byng, Admiral the Hon. John, commands off the Scottish coast, 1746, i 498; conduct at relief of Minorca, ii 269, 287 sqq.; trial by court-martial, ii 340 sqq.; West's and Blakeney's evidence against, ii 355, 380; sentence of the court-martial, ii 341; proceedings in Parliament regarding, ii 343 sqq.; made a victim and a hero, ii 273; Pitt and Lord Temple's support of, ii 342, 344, 365; George II refuses to pardon, ii 343; H.'s firm attitude on his condemnation, ii 343; Voltaire's intervention on behalf of, ii 343; Richelieu's letter of recommendation of, ii 343, 357; execution of, ii 344; crime and motives, ii 347; aspersions upon his courage unfounded, ii 157, 347; Joseph Yorke's opinion of conduct of, ii 269; correspondence, ii 287 sqq., 291 sqq., 340 *n.*; omission of passages in by the government justified, ii 353

Byron, Lord, victory over the French fleet, iii 152

C

Cabello, Porto, account of failure of attack upon, i 311

Cabinet, the, nature of, on record in Parliament, ii 118

Cabotage, ii 312

Calais, writ of Habeas Corpus awarded out of the K. B. to, iii 10

Calcraft, John, note on, ii 325; deserts Fox for Pitt, iii 388

Calcutta, capture of by Surajah Dowlah, ii 273; outrage of the Black Hole of, ii 273; Clive recaptures, ii 274; Clive's account of, ii 385

Calendar, change to the new style, ii 54; hostility to, ii 76

Cambridge University, H. and N. refuse to convey address of congratulation on the Peace of Paris to George III, iii 384; contest for the High Stewardship of, iii 257, 484, 561

Cambridgeshire election, campaign of, ii 160 sqq.; cost of, ii 161

Cambridgeshire, roads in, H. contributes to improvements of, ii 568

Cameron, Dr Archibald, execution of, i 537

Cameron, Colonels Donald and John, *see* Lochiel

Camerons, join the Young Pretender, i 447, 451; quarrel with the MacDonalds, i 519; 300 captured, i 542

Campbell, Hon. Alexander Hume, note on, ii 380, 382; hesitates to take office, ii 397; manager for the Whigs in the Minorca inquiry, ii 351

Campbell of Barceldine, i 557

Campbell of Calder, refutes story of cruelties after Culloden, i 552

Campbell of Carwhin, commands Lord Glenorchy's men, i 519

Campbell, Lt.-Gen. Hon. Sir James, killed at Fontenoy, note on, i 393, 395, 404

Campbell, John, Lord Chancellor, inaccuracy and misstatements of, ii 463 *n.*, 483 *n.*, 519 *n.*, 571 *n.*; baseless calumny of, ii 559-60 *n.*; untrustworthy account of H., ii 503, 561 *n.*; on right of Secretary of State to issue warrants, iii 463 *n.*

Campbell, Colin, of Glenure, murder of, i 556 sqq.

Campbell, Capt., of Knockbuy, D. of Cumberland's order to, i 532 *n.*

Campbell, General, collects militia in Argyllshire against the rebels, i 514

Canada, military plans for conquest of, 1754, ii 257

Candidate, The, iii 485

Cannenberg, Major-General, i 643

Cannon, Robert, Dean of Lincoln, ii 545 *n.*

Cannon, Thomas, note on, ii 545; appeal to H., ii 545; correspondence, ii 545
Canon law, authority of, ii 22–3; marriage under, ii 74
Canons of 1603–4, i 124; of no authority over laymen, i 122; violated by the clergy, ii 74
Canons of Criticism, i 213
Canterbury, Archbishop of, dignity and precedence of, ii 414; revenue of, ii 82
Canterbury, prerogative court of, mandamus to, i 124 *n.*
Carew, T., M.P., i 478
Carleton, Sir Dudley, *Letters* pub. by Lord Royston, ii 146
Carlisle, Henry, 4th Earl of, nominated Lord Privy Seal 1746, i 427; disappointment of, i 430
Carlisle, captured by the Young Pretender, i 416, 465; siege of by D. of Cumberland, i 487–8; retaken by the King's forces, i 425, 492; punishment of rebels captured at, i 536
Carlile, John, Clerk of the Passage at Dover, correspondence, i 18, 20
Carlyle, Alexander, account of debate on Habeas Corpus Bill, 1758, iii 5; impressions of Pitt's eloquence, iii 6
Carnarvon, Henry, Marquess of, afterwards Duke of Chandos, i 171
Carolina, boundaries of disputed by Spain, i 186
Caroline, Queen, as regent, i 152; hatred of the Prince of Wales, i 166, 170 *n.*; death, i 182; regret for, ii 533, 535
Carrickfergus, annihilation of French expedition to, iii 152
Carrington, Nathan, messenger of the Secretary of State, seizes the press of the *North Briton*, iii 487
Carpenter, Col., killed at Fontenoy, i 393
Carpenter v. *Farrant*, i 127 *n.*
Carshalton House, H.'s purchase of and residence at, i 108; Lord and Lady Anson's residence at, ii 158, 168
Carte v. *Carte*, ii 441
Carter, Mrs Elizabeth, on H. in his last illness, iii 483
Carteret, Lord, *see* Granville, Earl
Carthagena, failure of Vernon at, i 195; capture of, i 254
Carvajal, Spanish Minister, ii 25
Casborne v. *Scarfe*, ii 424, 462
Cases temp. Hardwicke, ii 430 *n.*
Cathcart, 8th Baron, i 247 and *n.*
Cathcart, Charles, 9th Baron, wounded at Fontenoy, note on, i 393, ii 167; befriended by the D. of Cumberland, i 413, 554; claims for promotion, ii 91–2, 169; disappointed, ii 149
Catherine, Empress of Russia, accession of, iii 297; Poniatowski the lover of, ii 579
Catherlough, Lord, iii 563
Causidicade, The, ii 529
Causticks applied to the Causidicade, ii 529 *n.*
Cavendish, Admiral, i 225, 226
Cavendish, Lord John, on Pitt's resignation, iii 288 *n.*; on Charles Yorke's speech in defence of George II, iii 340 *n.*; at debate on General Warrants, iii 562; correspondence, iii 288 *n.*, 340 *n.*
Cecil, Col., Jacobite agent, i 397 *n.*; arrest of, i 529 *n.*
Chace, Essay on the, by H., i 102
Chambers, Edward, i 16
Chambrier, Baron de, Prussian Minister at Paris, ii 166
Chancellor, Lord, equity jurisdiction of, *see* Yorke, Philip, 1st Earl of Hardwicke
Chancery, Court of, *see* Yorke, Philip, 1st Earl of Hardwicke
Chandernagore, capture of, iii 169
Channel Islands, writ of Habeas Corpus awarded out of the K. B. to, iii 10
Chapman, Sir John, attack upon his house by militia rioters, iii 32
Chapman v. *Bilson*, i 124 *n.*
Charities, administration of, Lord Chancellor's and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster's jurisdiction over, ii 418
Charitable Uses Bill, *see* Mortmain Act
Charlemont, Lord, on George II, iii 155
Charles VII, Emperor, election of, i 204, 269; death of, i 625; political consequences, i 388
Charles III, King of Spain (Charles VII, King of Naples), forced into a neutrality by threat of British bombardment, i 293; iii 142; change of attitude towards England at accession, iii 142, 151; disavows Abreu, iii 151; offers himself as mediator between France and England, iii 143; H. opposed to, iii 241; declined by Pitt, iii 143, 236; accepted by France, iii 143; emotion on news of the British conquest of Quebec, iii 143; becomes again hostile, iii 151; *see* also Spain
Charles, the Young Pretender, congratulates Louis XV on victory at Fontenoy, i 433; attainder of, i 327; expedition of 1745, i 415 sqq.; lands in Scotland, i 434 sqq., 437–47; refuses to return to France, i 442, 447; price put on his head, i 419, 436; declares against the maintenance of the Union, i 433, 451; progress of, i 451; surprising success of, i 462; captures Edinburgh, i 456; conversation with Lord Breadalbane, will not suffer any impediments from religion, pretends to join Church of England, i 470; outrages of his troops, i 532, 535; marches to Derby, i 424; retreat from Derby, i 425, 477; retires north, i 498; "out of order," i 495; difficulties with the Highland chiefs, i 576; at Gordon Castle, i 511; supposed order at Culloden to give no quarter, i 531, 577; flight from Culloden, i 524; subsequent movements,

i 528, 540, 542, 544; subsequent account of, i 601 *n.*, iii 256 *n.*; Frederick of Prussia's letter of sympathy to after Rebellion, ii 7 *n.*; description of his person, i 447; residence of, i 660; forced to leave France by Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, i 633; honours paid to his birthday in Edinburgh, i 618; visit to England, iii 256 *n.*

Charles, Prince of Lorraine, commander of the Austrian forces, note on, i 302, 315, 345; threatens Strasburg, i 330; obliged to repass the Rhine 1744, i 358; defeated at Hohenfriedberg by Frederick, i 412

Charlotte, Queen, marriage to George III, iii 264; supposed influence employed against Bute, iii 494

Cherbourg, expedition to, iii 117 *n.*, 230; failure of, iii 126; responsibility of Leicester House, iii 118

Chesterfield, Philip, 4th Earl of, character and talents, i 281; flowery oratory, i 326; George II's hostility to, i 389; supports the Prince of Wales against George II, i 177; speech on the Spanish Convention, i 188; votes for Walpole's removal, i 202, 252; supports attempt to impeach Walpole, i 289; denounces in opposition grant of money to Hanoverian troops, i 293, 296; rejects overtures from Granville and the Prince of Wales, i 336; opposes Treason Act of 1744, i 328; negotiations of the ministers with, 1744, i 367; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Ambassador at the Hague 1744, i 378; concludes Quadruple Alliance, i 335 *n.*; concludes treaty with Holland, i 388; moderate conduct in 1745, i 391 *n.*; on failure of "ministry of 40 hours," i 429; states his views and is appointed Secretary, i 628, 630, 637; conduct in office, i 630; approves of D'Argenson's proposals for peace, i 627; speaks in support of Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 614; objects to N.'s separate correspondence with ministers abroad, iii 22 *n.*; resignation, policy and opinions of, i 628; coldness of Lord Bath towards, ii 168; aversion to the war, 1756, ii 310; on Loudoun's and Holborne's failure at Louisburg, iii 116; advises N. to retire, ii 311; mediator between N. and the Princess of Wales, ii 366; arranges conference of N. with Bute, ii 398; despair of the situation in 1757, iii 123; on relations between Pitt and N., iii 28; congratulates N. on Pitt's resignation, iii 291; advises his son to make court to Joseph Yorke, ii 149, 575; on the law as a profession, ii 527 *n.*; character of H., i 75, ii 481, 567; Mrs Montagu on, ii 569; on the candidature of Lords Royston and Sandwich for the High Stewardship of Cambridge University, iii 485; correspondence, i 468

Chesterfield v. *Janssen*, ii 431, 452

Chetwynd, William, 3rd Viscount, note on, i 311

Chetwynd v. *Fleetwood*, decree of H. appealed from, ii 478

Cheüses, M., Danish Minister at the Hague, and the Hanover Neutrality, iii 173

Chicheley, Sir Thomas, i 206

Chief Justice, Lord, K.B., salary, i 118 *n.*

Chief Justices, jurisdiction over offenders against ambassadors, ii 418

Child, Joice, wife of Richard Somers, i 69

Children, right of to provision by their parents, ii 447

Chilton, Simon Yorke's property of, i 22; Charles Yorke visits, ii 164

Chisholm, Col., Jacobite, killed at Culloden, i 524

Choiseul, Duc de, diplomacy of in negotiations for peace with England, 1759, iii 145; disappointment at absence of support given by Spain, iii 151; desire for peace through the separate negotiation, Gen. Yorke on, iii 313; attempts to secure mediation of Denmark, iii 144; against peace, 1760, iii 244; diplomacy of 1761, iii 270; sincerity in the negotiations, iii 270; terms of peace proposed by, June 1761, iii 318; declines to give up the Newfoundland Fisheries, iii 269, 321; sincerity in discussing peace, iii 281–2; Sir J. Yorke's suspicions of, iii 327; attitude in the negotiations for peace changed by Pitt's despatch of June 26, 1761, iii 270; retort to Pitt, iii 284; decides to agree to the Family Compact, iii 271, 283; letter to D'Havrincourt, H. on, iii 341; correspondence and instructions to Bussy, iii 270, 282; prolongs negotiations only to secure delay, iii 270; justification of his diplomacy, iii 270 *n.*; Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 337; terms of peace proposed to, May 1762, iii 299; Bute's letter to urging a strong resistance against Prince Ferdinand's army, iii 369

Cholera, act to prevent the spreading of, repeal of, ii 57

Cholmondeley, George, 3rd Earl of (Viscount Malpas), letter to, note on, i 113; separates from the opposition, i 579

Cholmondeley, J., letter of, i 113

Cholmondeley v. *Countess of Oxford*, i 113 *n.*

Christianity, as part of the law of England, i 81, ii 471

Church of England, establishment of, part of the law of England, i 90; and Mortmain Acts, i 148; in Scotland, Jacobitism of, i 512, 617; Act suppressing Jacobitism in, and restricting exercise of functions, i 597–8; Lord Glenorchy upon, i 605; opposition of the bishops, i 615 sqq.

Church, Presbyterian, of Scotland, ministers' widows and children pension fund established, i 616
Churchill, Rev. Charles, author of *The Candidate*, iii 485
Churchill, General, in Scotland, i 556
Churchill, Harriet, marries Sir Everard Fawkener, i 583
Churchwardens, election of, i 124
Cider Bill, Bute's, iii 381, 456; consequent riots, iii 384; opposition to, Pitt sanguine of the effects of, iii 456; Bute on, iii 387; Charles Yorke on, iii 387; Bute endeavours to avoid address from the City against by promising repeal of, iii 456
Circumstantial evidence, H. on, i 557
Ciutadela, Marshal Richelieu lands at, ii 288
Clans system, i 493, 589 sqq.; necessity of abolishing, i 546; disappearance of, i 603, 616
Clarendon Code, i 17
Clarke, Mr, C. Y.'s friend in Lincoln's Inn, ii 179
Clarke, Sir Thomas, M.P., refuses to be a Commissioner of the Great Seal 1756, ii 338; declines the Great Seal, ii 371; correspondence of, i 221 and *n.*
Cleaverly, the messenger, ii 175
Clermont, Louis de Bourbon, Comte de, note on, iii 201
Cleveland, John, Secretary to the Admiralty, iii 215; and D. Mallet's pamphlet in defence of the government, ii 354; correspondence, ii 287, 291 sqq.
Clifton, engagement at, 1745, i 425, 485
Clive, Mr, barrister, i 111
Clive, Robert, Lord, gains victory of Arcot, ii 8; H.'s support of, ii 387; defeats Surajah Dowlah at Calcutta, ii 386; account of recapture of Calcutta and battle at, ii 274, 385; treaty with Mir Jafir, iii 169; visit of his father to H., iii 196; H.'s congratulations to and assurance of support, iii 195; eulogised by Pitt, iii 125; on situation and prospects in India, 1759, iii 233; gains victory of Plassey, ii 274, iii 125; visits H., iii 489; intrigues instigated by the court against, iii 258; opposition of the E. I. C. to his jaghire, iii 488; correspondence, ii 385, iii 169, 195, 232.
Closterseven, Convention of, iii 122, 177 sqq.; repudiation by the British ministers, iii 179; H. on, iii 182, 185; Col. Joseph Yorke on, iii 124, 177, 183 sqq.; Pitt urges George II to repudiate, iii 185, 194; Hanoverian ministers unanimous against breaking, iii 193; disapproval of George II, iii 180 sqq.; repudiated by George II, iii 124, 193
"Club, The," at Cambridge, i 252 *n.*
Coates, Mr, wine-merchant, iii 407
Cobham, Richard Temple, Viscount, note on, i 391, 409; rejects overtures of Granville and the Prince of Wales, i 336
Cochrane v. *Campbell*, ii 60
Cocks, Lady Anne, i 69
Cocks, Charles, M.P. for Worcester, i 69, 70
Cocks, Charles, 1st Lord Somers of the 2nd creation, i 69, 71
Cocks, Elizabeth, *see* Jekyll, Lady
Cocks, James, i 69; wills of, i 70
Cocks, James, of the Grenadier Guards, i 69; killed at St Cast, i 70, iii 126
Cocks, John, i 69, 71, 153
Cocks, Margaret, *see* Yorke, Margaret, Countess of Hardwicke
Cocks, Mary, heiress of Castleditch, i 69, 71
Cocks, Mary, *see* Williams, Mary, Lady
Cocks, Mr, of the Ordnance, vote in favour of the Peace of Paris, iii 441
Coining, offence of, i 137
Coke, Sir Edward, dispute with Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, ii 416; on the enormous burden of the Chancellor's duties, ii 501; dictum on status of Jews, ii 127 sqq.; dictum excluding evidence of infidel witnesses contradicted by Sir Matthew Hale, ii 458–9; rejected by H., ii 460
Coke, Lord, speech of on Lord Lovat's trial, i 581
Colberg, capture by the Russians, iii 267
Cole, Rev. William, notes of, i 10; disapproval of the Yorke family, ii 566; on the 2nd Lord Hardwicke, ii 147; conversation with Horace Walpole on Lady Hardwicke, ii 566
College of Physicians, admittance to, in Schomberg's Case, ii 120 *n.*
Collier, David, letter of, i 108
Collins, Richard Henn, M.R., on the position of the Judges in England, ii 523 *n.*
Cologne, Elector of, demands for subsidies of, ii 26, 108
Colonies, exclusion of foreign trade from, ii 312, iii 136; parliaments of, interference by Privy Council in laws made by questioned, i 91; how far independent, i 90; taxation of by the Crown and Parliament, i 89; proposal to extend ecclesiastical jurisdiction to, i 90
Common Law, value of precedents in, i 129; inadequate to cope with lawlessness, i 131; jurisdiction, separation from equity jurisdiction, ii 416, 510 sqq.; advantages and disadvantages of, ii 510 sqq.; H. on, ii 552; Bacon on, ii 553; later amalgamation largely due to H.'s influence, ii 511; relations with the Chancellor's equity jurisdiction, ii 415 *n.*; right of Lord Chancellor to issue injunctions against Courts of, ii 416; encroachments upon by the Court of Chancery under Wolsey, ii 416; Bacon on, ii 554; injunctions against Courts of

issued cautiously by the Chancellors, ii 555; injunctions issued against by H., ii 475; relief in equity beyond and sometimes contrary to rules of, ii 450; rivalry with the Chancellor's equity jurisdiction, ii 435 sqq.; contest concerning uses, ii 435; "pacific penetration" of by equity, ii 439; ceases to be the rival and becomes supplementary to equity, ii 436; extended to Ireland, iii 11
Commons, H. of, rights in money bills, i 606; inquiries and determinations in libel cases, iii 502
Competition of opposite analogies, ii 495
Comyns, Sir John, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, note on, eulogised by R. Savage, i 128; case of *Harvey* v. *Aston* heard by, ii 445
Conceau, Pitt's objections to ceding, iii 273
Considerations on the Law of Forfeiture for High Treason, by Charles Yorke, i 328
Considerations on the Present German War, iii 290 *n.*
Constitution, balance of the, i 144; H. on, ii 263–4, iii 15; H.'s warning against tampering with, i 199; envy of other nations, i 145
Constitutional government, i 429, 504; H. on, iii 468; and George II, i 379 sqq.; patronage, ii 225; *see* also party government
Constitutional Queries, ii 44, iii 503
Contade, Marshal, coach and papers captured at Minden, iii 234
Contest, The, ii 373 *n.*
Contraband Trade, ii 312 sqq.
Conventicle Act, i 18
Conveyancers, Lord Chancellor Henley's contemptuous reference to and H.'s defence of, iii 390
Conviction of an offender before consideration of the question of law censured by H., ii 433
Convocation, powers of, i 122
Conway, Hon. Henry, note on, i 410 *n.*
Cooke, George, M.P. for Middlesex, iii 563
Cooksey, Richard, anonymous and mendacious correspondent of, ii 502, 559–60; on Lady Hardwicke, ii 566
Cooper, C. P., untrustworthiness of his account of chancery delays, ii 503 *n.*
Coote, Sir Eyre, advancement of, iii 113; merits urged by Col. Joseph Yorke, iii 114; victory at Wandewash, iii 152
Cope, Sir John, marches away from the rebels to Inverness, i 445, 447, 452 sqq.; lands at Dunbar, i 456; defeat at Prestonpans, i 415, 457 sqq.; his dispositions at Prestonpans condemned, i 460; and praised, i 459; acquitted of blame, i 461 *n.*
Copyright, decrees in cases of by H., ii 464; abridgements, ii 464
Corbach, defeat of Hereditary Prince of Brunswick at, iii 153
Corbett, Richard, prosecution of, i 79
Cornwall, riots in, i 92, 134, 152
Cornwallis, Colonel, on Byng's Council of War, ii 292
Coroners, dismissal of by the Chancellor for misconduct, ii 419
Corporation Act, i 17, 30
Corporations, Walpole's manipulation of, ii 541 *n.*
Corporations, bill for further quieting of, i 291
Cottenham, Lord Chancellor, on "the golden age of equity," ii 506
Cotton, Sir John Hynde, note on, i 583; implicated by Murray of Broughton in the Rebellion, i 582–3; obstructive conduct in parliament, i 464; admitted into administration, i 378; in suit of *Garth* v. *Cotton*, ii 449
Court, Alice, *see* Yorke, Alice
Courts-martial, *see* Army
Coventry, Lord Keeper, development of equity under, ii 554
Coventry, William, 5th Earl of, i 253
Coventry, Henry, contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 207
Cowper, Lord Chancellor, increased authority of precedents under, ii 423; and *Shelley's Case*, ii 426; decree confirmed by H., ii 427; offices obtained by for his family, ii 181
Cowper, Mr, barrister, i 110
Cowper v. *Cowper*, ii 438 *n.*
Coxe, John Hippesley, correspondence, i 9, 10, 12
Coxe, John, i 9
Cradock, Joseph, on the D. of N., i 286–7
Craftsman, The, prosecutions of, i 82 sqq.
Craggs, James, i 237 *n.*
Craigie, Robert, Lord Advocate of Scotland and Lord President of the Court of Session, note on, i 442; character of, i 621; zeal in Scotland, i 551; supports alterations in the Hereditary Jurisdictions of Scotland bill, i 607
Cramahé, secretary to Joseph Yorke, death of, ii 153
Crawford, 20th Earl of, note on, i 518; "highland mad," i 534
Crefeld, Prince Ferdinand's victory at, iii 118, 126
Cresset, James, note on, ii 249
Crime by implication, i 151
Criminal law, severity of, i 132
Croats, Frederick of Prussia on formidable character of, iii 224
Cromarty, George, 3rd Earl of, note on, i 571; government pension of, i 570 *n.*; accused of cruelties, i 532 *n.*; trial of, i 559
Cromwell, Oliver, the Protector, abolishes hereditary jurisdictions in Scotland, i 608

Cromwell, Richard, loyal addresses to, i 458
Crown, power of, to abrogate colonial legislation, i 90
Cullen, —, of Dover, i 16
Culloden, battle of, Joseph Yorke's account of, i 521 sqq., 527–8; landmark in British history, i 432
Cumberland, William, Duke of, project of making King instead of the Prince of Wales, i 179 *n.*; takes command of troops in Flanders, i 388; conduct at Fontenoy, i 393, 394; dispositions at Fontenoy, i 404 sqq.; sheds tears after defeat, i 399, 407; returns with his troops to suppress Rebellion, i 419; pursuit of the rebels, i 424; fails to stop the rebels' march into England, i 474; overtakes the rebels, i 425; puts new life into troops in Scotland, i 494; wins battle of Culloden, i 431, 521 sqq.; pension given to after Culloden, i 526; order after the battle instigating reprisals, i 531; another similar order of, i 532 *n.*; charges of cruelties, i 513, 533; calumnies concerning, i 518, 552; suppression of the Rebellion, i 497, 510, 512, 528; measures of, i 535, 542 sqq.; conduct commended, i 536; able military conduct of, i 540; firmness of, i 517; "a young man not to be trifled with," i 543; resolution and disinterestedness, i 544; prudence and perseverance, i 528; H.'s tributes to, i 526; marauding severely punished by, i 535; humanity of, opposed to leniency, i 534; treats Rebellion as a national movement, i 530; instils unjust prejudices against Scotsmen into the K.'s mind, i 531; against Lord Breadalbane, i 554 *n.*; letter of H. to on Hereditary Jurisdictions of Scotland bill, i 607; on state of Scotland and murder of Campbell of Glenure, i 556; gives the King a list of supposed Jacobites in office in Scotland, ii 47; grows fat, i 549; unpopularity of, ii 84; encouraged by the Prince and Princess of Wales, ii 44; returns to Flanders, i 626; difficulties of his command, i 654; friendship for Col. Joseph Yorke, ii 167, 173; dispositions at battle of Lauffeld, i 640 sqq.; nearly captured, i 646; French propose negotiating with, i 631; against D'Argenson's proposals for peace, i 636; attitude towards the Peace, i 628; and N.'s forward foreign policy, ii 14; friendship for Lord Sandwich, ii 13, 44, 115; takes Sandwich's and Bedford's part in dispute with N., i 660 sqq., ii 39, 41 sqq.; under their influence, ii 85–7; deterioration in character, ii 43–4; conduct displeasing to the King, ii 171; hostility to the ministers and opposition, i 555, ii 44 sqq., 71, 113 sqq.; cabals against the ministers, ii 84 sqq., 181 *n.*; influences the King against them, ii 47; results on George Prince of Wales's education, ii 45; influences character of Regency Bill, ii 45 sqq.; appointed President of the Board of Regency and not Regent, 1757, ii 45; answer to H. on being notified of the Regency Bill, ii 46; gives the cold shoulder to Col. Joseph Yorke, ii 46, 174; and the Mutiny Bill, ii 167; friend and patron of Fox, ii 187, 206, 328, iii 362; applies H.'s strictures upon Fox to himself, ii 68 *n.*; influences the King against Pitt and in favour of Fox, ii 198; hostility to Pitt, ii 187; suspected by the government of ambitious designs, ii 199; compared to Richard III in *Constitutional Queries*, ii 44; George Prince of Wales's fear of, ii 44; political schemes of, ii 44; excluded from the Regency Board, ii 45; H. opposes his access to, ii 199; obtains seat in the Council of Regency, ii 195; addition to his power and influence, ii 199; bad condition of the army under, ii 256; bad military appointments of, ii 199; George II and H. on, iii 192, 193; control of military matters, ii 282; Gen. Yorke on mischief of, iii 113 *n.*; opinion of the alliances abroad, ii 318; factious conduct of in precipitating the war, ii 129, 200 *n.*, 256, 258, 282; advises Fox to throw up his office, ii 194; instigates the inclusion in the Address of thanks to the King for the Hanoverian troops, ii 375; paramount influence of, ii 390; hostility to N., ii 388; impedes Pitt's military plans, ii 380; refuses to take up his command in Germany unless Pitt is removed from office, ii 365, 394; in command in Hanover, Col. Yorke advises reinforcements for, iii 158–9; opposition of Leicester House to support of in Hanover, iii 118; conduct of, iii 177; H. on, iii 188 sqq.; disastrous campaign of, iii 119; Col. Joseph Yorke on, iii 119; Gen. Zastrow on, iii 119 *n.*; defeat of at Hastenbeck and subsequent retreat, iii 119, 160 sqq., 407; Col. Joseph Yorke's criticisms of, iii 167, 169; Richelieu's delay in pursuing, ii 348 *n.*; sends proposal to Duc de Richelieu for suspension of arms, Richelieu's reply to, iii 172; despairing letters to George II, iii 166; George II's instructions to, iii 120 sqq., 167, 182 sqq.; Pitt and H. on, iii 122 *n.*; D'Abreu's misrepresentation of, H. on, iii 194; supports George II's application for terms from Vienna, iii 173; agrees to the Convention of Closterseven, iii 122, 177 sqq.; George II's indignation at, iii 174, 180 sqq., 191 sqq.; conduct of blamed in Hanover, iii 174; George II's reception of on his return, iii 188; disgrace of, iii 122; resigns his military appointments, iii 122, 188, 191; Wolfe on his resignation, iii 113;

defence of, iii 120, 122 *n.*; generous treatment of by the ministers, iii 122 *n.*; H. endeavours to secure justice for, iii 194; H. urges N. to endeavour to soften the King's anger against, iii 189; H. in mitigation of conduct of, iii 183; gratified by Pitt's justification of him, H. on, note of Lord Royston on, iii 193, 194; end of influence in military affairs, iii 113; falls into ill-health, iii 122; George II relents towards, iii 189–91; disapproval of Pitt's scheme of raising Highland regiments, ii 384; advises N. to resign, iii 354; on N.'s resignation and conduct, iii 302; plan of administration, 1762, iii 411; conversation and interviews with N., iii 418, 423; expresses his disapproval of the terms of Peace to George III, iii 419; hostility to Bute, iii 418; disapproval of Fox's alliance with Bute, iii 423; conversation with Fox, iii 423; Fox's attempts to regain friendship of, iii 451; declines contemptuously command of the army offered by Fox, iii 423; complaints by George III and Bute of his returns to their overtures, iii 423; advises N. against embarking in organised opposition, iii 380, 445; on George III's expulsion of the D. of Devonshire from office, iii 429; on Bute's and Fox's proscriptions, iii 446; influence over N., iii 363 *n.*; alliance with N. in opposition, iii 372; H.'s objections to, iii 362, 390; H.'s objections to as leader of the Whigs, iii 444; H.'s opinion of as pushing on the opposition, iii 446; endeavours to persuade Pitt to join the opposition, iii 476, 546; expresses his approval of Pratt's conduct, iii 519; conference of Pitt with, iii 546; plan of a ministry, H. on, iii 532; further interviews with N., iii 531; on privilege and prerogative, iii 544; on Charles Yorke's great sacrifice, iii 544; flattering opinion of Charles Yorke, iii 411; "in love with the Yorkes," iii 559; proposed visit to H. to explain his conduct, iii 483, 559; correspondence, i 413, 548, 681, ii 167, 170, 172 sqq., iii 166, 544, 546, 562

Cuming, Rev. Patrick, Moderator of the General Assembly, letter from, i 616

Cunningham v. *Chalmers*, ii 539

Cunyngham v. *Cunyngham*, ii 516

Curll, Edmund, prosecution of, i 81

Cutler, Rev. Timothy, note on, petition of, i 90

Czaslow, battle of, i 319

D

Dalrymple, Sir Hugh, condemns Cope's dispositions at Prestonpans, i 460

Dalrymple, Sir John, of Cranstoun, gratitude to Charles Yorke, ii 145

Dame Inconnue, La, the Dowager Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst, iii 65; incident of, iii 22

Damer, Mr, ii 168

Danby, Earl of, pardon under the Great Seal, i 67

Darby, John, prosecutor, i 136

Dashwood, Sir Francis, made Chancellor of the Exchequer, iii 258, 360; small abilities of, iii 382, 387; accompanies Bute to the Guildhall and assaulted, iii 383; made Lord Le Despencer and obtains the Great Wardrobe, iii 388

Dauphin, the, i 356

Davenport v. *Oldis*, ii 429

Dawkins, James, of Over Norton, Jacobite emissary, note on, i 601 *n.*

Day, —, of Dover, i 16

Dayrolles, Solomon, note on, ii 31

Debts, payment of just, priority of, ii 425

De Donis Conditionalibus, statute of, judicial interpretation of, ii 543

Deeds and wills, inviolability of, ii 447

Delany, Mrs, remarks upon Lady Anson, ii 158

De la Warr, Lord, with George II at Hanover, ii 284

Delegates, Court of, issue by the Lord Chancellor of commission appointing, ii 418

De minimis non curat lex, maxim of, ii 497

Démont, surrender of, i 358

Denmark, relations with, ii 16; secured by France, ii 17 sqq.; convention of Closterseven made under auspices of, iii 122; position of, 1758, iii 196; joins Holland in complaints against England, iii 136; suspected mediation of, 1759, iii 239, rejected by the British Cabinet, iii 144

Dennis, Lieutenant, recommended by Anson, i 347

Denton, A., correspondence with H., i 117 *n.*

Derby, Earl of, v. *Duke of Atholl*, ii 463, 515

Derby, arrival of the rebels at, i 424

Derwentwater estate, sale of, inquiry into, i 98

Desertion, death penalty for supported by H., ii 54

"Despicable electorate, the," i 292

Dessau, Prince Maurice of, General Yorke's account of, iii 224

Dettingen, battle of, i 297, 314 sqq.; advantages wasted, i 331, 339

Devonshire, 3rd Duke of, i 162, 165, 176, 179 *n.*; opposes motion for removal of Walpole, i 252; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 333; present at cabinet council on death of Henry Pelham, ii 191; declines to be head of new administration, ii 207; on Fox and Pitt, ii 222; opposition to the Hessian treaty, ii 241

Devonshire, William, 4th Duke of (Lord Hartington), note on, ii 113; called up to H. of Lords as Baron Cavendish, ii 113; present at cabinet council on death of Henry Pelham, ii 191; supporter of Fox, ii 188 *n.*; brings Fox to H., ii 188 *n.*; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, ii 51; supports Lord Anson, ii 333; the King's desire to gain over from Fox, ii 304; intermediary between Fox and Pitt, ii 333; First Lord of the Treasury, ii 280; intermediary between the King and Pitt, ii 380; admits inclusion of thanks to the King in the Address for the Hanoverian troops, ii 360, 375; Pitt on, Dec. 1756, ii 376; nominal head of administration on Pitt's dismissal, ii 365; presses N. to take the government, ii 389; in negotiations for new administration, ii 388; and the Fox-Waldegrave fiasco, ii 399; in the negotiations concerning the Pitt-Newcastle ministry, ii 401; Lord Chamberlain, ii 370; summoned to town at the Hanoverian crisis, iii 166; becomes an opponent of the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 18 *n.*; supports the giving of the Garter to Lord Temple, iii 59; George II on, iii 61; advises N. to remain in office at George III's accession, iii 261, 307; concurs in the breaking off of the negotiations with France, iii 274; speech at the cabinet meeting of Sept. 21, 1761, iii 325; acts with the Whig Lords against Pitt, iii 322; opposes war with Spain at cabinet of Oct. 2, 1761, iii 279; conversation of Bute with on the negotiations for peace, iii 406; opposes Bute's withdrawal of the Prussian subsidy, iii 302, 350, 352 *n.*; induces H. to oppose the peace in the Lords, iii 372, 449; declares his intention of attending no more councils, iii 357; left out of the cabinet council, iii 435; advises N. to resign, iii 353 sqq.; conference with Bute on N.'s resignation, iii 357; unfavourable opinion of Bute, iii 429; expresses to Fox his disapproval of his alliance with Bute, iii 429; expelled from office, iii 370; comments of N., D. of Cumberland, Fox, Pitt and H. on, iii 428 sqq.; resigns his Lord Lieutenancy, iii 377; conversation with Lord Temple on Pitt's intentions, iii 455; advises N. to maintain attitude of inaction, iii 380, 448; on N.'s letter of reproach to H. and the latter's reply, iii 449; opposition dinner at his house, iii 381, 455; summoned to London on Pitt's negotiation with George III, iii 525; Charles Yorke advises with, iii 473; on Pitt's intentions regarding the accommodation of Charles Yorke's and Pratt's claims to the Great Seal, iii 499; support of Charles Yorke, iii 521, 540; on Charles Yorke's great sacrifice by his resignation, iii 544; conference with Pratt on Pitt's refusal to unite, and the difference with Charles Yorke, iii 557; Charles Yorke counsel in cause of, ii 573; correspondence, ii 400, 401, iii 328 sqq., 335 sqq., 395, 445 sqq., 454 sqq., 499, 516 sqq., 529 *n.*, 531 sqq., 536 sqq., 546, 557 sqq., 560 sqq.

Dickens, Charles, on delays in chancery, ii 500 *n.*

Dickens, John, *Reports*, ii 432 *n.*

Discourse, A, of the Judicial Authority belonging to the office of the M. R., i 94, ii 415 *n.*

Distributions, statute of, construction by rules of the civil law, ii 487

Diversions (military), policy of, iii 117; Col. J. Yorke's support of, ii 411

Divine Legation, The, dedication to H., ii 561

Dixon v. *Parker*, ii 510

Doctors, Lord Anson's opinion of, ii 594

Doctrinaire politics, H.'s warning against, i 199

Dodington, Bubb, one of Frederick Prince of Wales's prospective ministers, ii 42; on Militia Bill, ii 260 *n.*; supports late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 359; on Pitt's difficulties in making a peace, iii 287; adviser of Bute, iii 370; correspondence, iii 287, 370 *n.*; diary quoted, ii 236

Doddridge, Rev. Philip, note on, ii 583; H. rejects a candidate for holy orders from, ii 560, 583; correspondence, ii 583

Dodsley, printer of *Manners, a Satire*, imprisoned by the House of Lords, i 220

Dominica, French fail to evacuate, ii 7; capture of, iii 267

Dompton estate in Kent, purchased by H., ii 164

Donations *mortis causa*, delivery necessary for validity, ii 455

Dorell, John, prosecution of, i 62

Dorset, Lionel, 1st Duke of, note on, supports the Pelhams against Granville, i 179 *n.*, 369, 371; opposes Convention of Hanau, i 323; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 333; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, administration disturbed by factions, ii 50, 125; supported by the ministers, ii 125; obliged to resign, made Master of the Horse, ii 51; proposed for Groom of the Stole, ii 225

Dottin, Mary, *see* Billingsley, Mary

Douglas, Colonel, killed in West Indian expedition, i 257

Douglas case, Lord Mansfield's conduct of criticised, ii 512

Dover, political situation at, i 14; arrival of French refugees at, i 15; moderation of the Town Council, conventicles at, i 18, 20; attack on the liberties of the Corporation, i 28; submission of the Town Council to Charles II, expelled

and restored by James II, i 29; H.'s maintenance of old friendships at, ii 164; attachment and services to, ii 563 sqq., 587; contributes to harbour improvements, ii 568; legacy to, iii 486; portrait in the Town Hall, ii 164; Treaty of, i 20
Dowdeswell family, sale of Forthampton estate to Bishop Maddox, ii 597
Draycott, Anna Maria, marries the 2nd Earl of Pomfret, ii 548 *n.*
Dresden, Frederick II of Prussia loses, iii 142; bombardment by Frederick, iii 153; Peace of, i 626
Drummond, Lord John, with French troops in 1746, i 496; directs French troops to surrender, i 526; accompanies the Young Pretender after Culloden, i 528; case of, H. objects to publication of, ii 434
Drummond, Lord Provost of Edinburgh, correspondence, i 620
Drury v. *Drury*, Lord Chancellor Henley's decree in reversed by the Lords, iii 389–90
Duelling, H. on, ii 589
Duhamel v. *Ardouin*, ii 477
Dunbar, James, Earl of, minister of the Pretender, ii 47
Dunciad Notes, i 213
Duncombe, John, lines addressed to James Yorke, ii 155
Duncombe, William, inscription of *Junius Brutus* to H. by, ii 561
Dundas, Robert, Lord Arniston, Lord President of the Court of Session, note on, i 550; account of Scotland, i 602; supports alteration in the Hereditary Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 607; and libels against Scotland, iii 503; correspondence, i 550, 614, 619, 621–2, ii 546, 595, iii 109, 504
Dundas, Thomas, M.P. for Richmond, iii 563
Dundee, population of before the Rebellion, i 602 *n.*
Dunkirk, fortification of, i 631, ii 153; sea fortifications forbidden by Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, i 633; secret attempts by the French to fortify, ii 7
Dunmore, 2nd Earl of, letter interceding for his brother, i 548
Dunmore, 3rd Earl of, pardoned for complicity in the Rebellion, i 548
Dunning, John, afterwards 1st Lord Ashburton, note on, counsel for the plaintiff in *Huckwell* v. *The Messengers of the Secretary of State*, iii 509
Duplessis, ex parte, ii 505 *n.*
Duquesne, Fort, French succeed in founding, ii 8, 255; British defeat at, ii 258; capture of, iii 137
Durand, Col., governor of Carlisle, i 492
Duroure's regiment, i 302
Dutch troops, sent to England in 1745, note on, i 455, 493; conduct at Fontenoy, i 405; at Lauffeld, i 642, 645
Dyer, Sir James, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, note on, cited by H., ii 447
Dyer, John, the poet, given preferment by H., ii 561

E

Eaton, Elizabeth, i 34
Eaton, Capt. Nicholas, i 34
Ecclesiastical Courts, jurisdiction, i 124 *n.*; clandestine marriages, ii 469; divergence of view of marriage from that in equity, ii 471; fail to control marriages, ii 471; control of proceedings by the Court of Chancery, ii 475; injunctions issued by H. against proceedings enforcing discreditable marriages, ii 471; powers restricted by the Marriage Act, ii 61; jurisdiction over marriage abrogated, ii 74; jurisdiction over laymen, i 121; proposal to extend jurisdiction to the colonies, i 90; proceedings for non-payment of tithes, i 149; Roman law in, ii 486
Eddisbury, Dr, of Erthig, i 25
Edes v. *Brereton*, ii 470
Edgcumbe, Richard, 1st Lord, i 253 and *n.*
Edinburgh, penalties inflicted upon on account of Porteous outrage, i 183; subsiding of agitation concerning, ii 533–4; occupied by the Young Pretender, i 415, 456; city of, improvement of, i 621
Education, essay on by H., i 103
Edward IV, instructions to Kirkeham, M.R., ii 422
Edwards, Thomas, i 11
Edwards, Thomas, author of *Canons of Criticism*, i 213; verses to H., ii 140; to Philip Yorke, ii 147 *n.*; to Charles Yorke, ii 142
Effingham, Thomas, 2nd Earl of, on Byng's Council of War, ii 292
Egerton, Jemima, *see* Brydges, Jemima
Egerton, Samuel, M.P. for Cheshire, absent from the debate on general warrants, iii 563
Egerton, William, dean of Carlisle, i 34
Eglinton, Alexander, 10th Earl of, nomination to governorship of Dumbarton Castle, iii 108
Egmont, John, 2nd Earl of, note on, ii 229; libel against the D. of Cumberland attributed to, ii 44; separates from opposition on the Marriage Bill, ii 66 *n.*; proposed inclusion in the ministry, ii 234; excluded from office, May 1757, ii 397; supports the Peace in the House of Lords, iii 436
Egremont, Charles Wyndham, 2nd Earl of, note on, iii 495; becomes Secretary of State, iii 292, 330, 388; despatch to Spain of Oct. 28, 1761, iii 294; N.'s disapproval of, iii 335; supports Bute's withdrawal of the Prussian subsidy, iii 352 *n.*; insists on an equivalent for

Havannah, iii 374; conversation with H. on Bute's resignation, iii 457; one of the triumvirate in George Grenville's administration, iii 498; conferences with H., 1763, iii 495, 512, 513; N. on object of, iii 497; Pitt's jealousy of, iii 468, 473, 518, 528; offers H. from George III the presidency of the Council, iii 513; jealousy of Lord Shelburne, iii 514; and Charles Yorke's succession to the Chancellorship, iii 408 sqq.; death of, iii 469; visit to Lord Anson, ii 587
Eichel, August Friedrich, Secretary to Frederick II of Prussia, iii 221
Elcho, David Wemyss, Lord, note on, i 471; account of barbarities, i 532
Eldon, John, Lord Chancellor, judicial methods, i 142, ii 500 *n.*; seldom wrote his judgments, ii 515 *n.*; inattention to the arguments of Counsel, ii 525; wanting in the power of generalisation, ii 491; arrest of development of equity under, ii 490; delays in Chancery under, causes of, ii 500; statistics of business done compared with H.'s, ii 506 sqq.; attendance at sittings of House of Lords compared with H.'s, ii 509 *n.*; reversal of only one decree, ii 481; false charge against of engrossing power, ii 479; attempt to bribe, ii 524; unmerited reflexions upon, ii 569; on necessity of certainty in the law, ii 427 *n.*; of systematic administration of justice, ii 498 *n.*; on retractations of wrong opinions by the Chancellors, ii 480 *n.*; on H.'s greatness, ii 484; quotes H. in speech on Roman Catholic Disabilities Bill, i 575 *n.*; his Oxford English Prize Essay, i 55 *n.*
Election, parliamentary, campaign, ii 160 sqq.; expenses, ii 161; treating, ii 161
Elizabeth, Empress of Russia, death of, consequences of, iii 297
Ellesmere, Lord Chancellor, dispute with Sir Edward Coke, ii 416; independence of his equity jurisdiction, ii 422
Elliot, Sir Gilbert, Bart., note on, ii 405; on H.'s argument against the Militia Bill, ii 265; correspondence, ii 265
Ellis, Wellbore, supports defence of late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 358
Ellis v. *Smith*, ii 424
Elwill, Sir John, Bart., Lord Pomfret's behaviour to; marries Lady Ranelagh, ii 549
Ely, Bishop of, Visitor of St John's College, Cambridge, cause decided by H. against, ii 463
Emden, British force despatched to garrison, iii 135
Emsdorf, success of Hereditary Prince of Brunswick at, iii 153
Enlistment, foreign, i 92
Ensenada, Marquis de la, note on, hostility to England, ii 25, iii 251
Entails, Statute of (*Quia Emptores*), i 148; in Scotland, mischief of, i 623–4; H. on, ii 544
Entick v. *Carrington*, iii 463–4
Equity, *see* Yorke, Philip, 1st Earl of Hardwicke, Lord Chancellor
Erle, Rawlinson, vote of in favour of the Peace, iii 441
Errol, Countess of, persuades Lord Kilmarnock to join the Rebellion, i 575
Erskine, Charles, Lord Tinwald, Lord Justice Clerk, note on, i 459, 551; letters of, i 460, 618
Erskine, Sir Charles, of Alva, on dangerous situation in Scotland, i 460
Erskine, Thomas, Lord, supports the rights of juries to the general verdict in libel cases, iii 465; on ignorance of the English judges of Scottish law, ii 481 *n.*
Essay on Woman, Wilkes expelled the House of Commons on account of, iii 482
Est-il Permis, iii 362
Estrées, Louis, Marshal D', note on, iii 160
Etough, Rev. Henry, refutes story of cruelties after Culloden, i 552; correspondence, ii 142, 307
Evelyn, Sir John, iii 407
Evelyn v. *Evelyn*, ii 425, 486
Evidence, general rule of, ii 459; general advertisement for, against a person, illegal, i 290; purchased, not admissible into the courts of law, i 289; of non-Christian witnesses, validity of, ii 457 sqq.; compulsory written in the Scottish courts, abolished, i 594
Exchequer, Court of, proceedings controlled by Court of Chancery, ii 476
Excise, Dr Johnson's definition of, i 99 *n.*; Bill, debates on, i 98 sqq.
Executors, suit against before probate, ii 426; rights of, ii 493 *n.*
Exeter, Brownlow, 9th Earl of, H.'s purchase of his house in Grosvenor Square, ii 556
Eyre, Chief Justice, ruling of, i 129
Eyre, Col., Gen. Yorke on, iii 237

F

Fairs in Scotland, profits of, i 611
Falkirk, rebel victory at, i 426, 495, 521
"False in one thing false in all things," doctrine of rejected by Lord Mansfield, ii 512
Family Compact, between France and Spain, 1733, i 186; of 1761, negotiations preceding, iii 145 sqq.; Choiseul decides to agree to, iii 271; Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 333; the consequence of the breakdown of the negotiations between England and France, iii 282; aim, character, and provisions of, iii 274, 282–3
Farley, i 82
Fawcett, —, accuses Murray and others of

Jacobitism, failure of his evidence, ii 47–8
Fawkener, Sir Everard, note on, i 494; secretary to the Duke of Cumberland, ii 175; and Lord Lovat's estate, i 580; examination of at Lord Lovat's trial; his marriage, Lord Lovat's joke at his expense, i 583
Fazakerley, Nicholas, note on, argument against Marriage Act, i 84, ii 120
Featherstonhaugh, Lady, praise of Joseph Yorke at Paris, ii 150
Felon, indemnity of a, i 290; aiding to escape a, i 127 *n.*
Felonies, new, by statute, i 131
Ferdinand VI, King of Spain, withdraws from the war, i 625; British influence paramount under, iii 142
Ferguson, Captain, i 579
Ferguson, minister of Loggeritte, on Jacobitism in Scotland, i 500
Fermer, General, iii 206
Ferrers, Lawrence, 4th Earl, separation from his wife, ii 574 *n.*; trial for murder, ii 573; H. objects to the publication of case of, ii 434
Fielding, Henry, supported by H. in his measures for suppressing lawlessness in London, ii 53; success of, ii 52; defends the Jews Bill, ii 131; on H.'s greatness, ii 528; correspondence with H., ii 53; letter of, ii 110
Fife, trade of, before Rebellion, i 602 *n.*
Finch, *Reports* of, stigmatized by H. as of no value, ii 430 *n.*
Finck, General, defeat and capitulation of at Maxen, iii 142
Findlater, 5th Earl of, note on, i 515; house occupied by the rebels, i 511, 515; speech in support of Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 613; supports alterations in, i 607
Findlater, Countess of, i 516, 520
Finkenstein, Prussian Minister, account of Joseph Yorke and conversation of, iii 129; correspondence, iii 134 *n.*, 141, 156 *n.*
Fitzgerald, Sir Thomas, *see* Geraldino
Fitz-Gibbons, *Reports* stigmatized by H. as of no value, ii 430 *n.*
Fitzjames, Abbot of, Bishop of Soissons, remonstrates with Louis XV, i 356
Fitzroy, Col. Charles, later Baron Southampton, note on, takes orders to Lord G. Sackville at Minden to advance, iii 235
Fitzsimmonds, J., pamphlet by, ii 504
Fleet marriages, ii 58
Fleming, Count, Saxon Minister in England, intercepted correspondence of, ii 20–1
Fleming v. *Bishop of Carlisle*, ii 450
Fletcher, Andrew, of Salton, account of Scotland, i 602
Fletcher, Andrew, Lord Milton, Lord Justice Clerk, note on, i 456
Florida, boundaries of disputed by Spain, i 186; obtained in exchange for Havannah by Peace of Paris, iii 374
Fogg's Weekly Journal, i 84
Fontainebleau, Treaty of, i 322
Fontenelle, Bernard de, note on, ii 186
Fontenoy, battle of, i 388, 392 sqq.; Capt. Joseph Yorke's account of and criticisms, i 403 sqq.; other accounts of, i 409 *n.*
Fool, The, abuse of Anson, Lord Granville's direction of, i 639
Forbes, 4th Lord, of Pitsligo, account of and petition in favour of, i 618; H. objects to the publication of case of, ii 434
Forbes, Duncan, of Culloden, Lord President of the Court of Session, account of, i 421; organises resistance to the rebels, i 506; urges leniency after Culloden, i 534; censured, i 536; attitude towards the reforms in Scotland, i 609, 612; reforms judicial administration in Scotland, ii 532 sqq.; H.'s support and encouragement, ii 532 sqq.; proposes amendment of Scottish laws, ii 532 sqq.; his great services unrecognised, i 531; correspondence, i 609 sqq., ii 488, 532 sqq.
Forbes, Hon. John, note on, ii 404
Forbes, capture of Fort Duquesne by, iii 137
Foreign Courts, credit given to sentences of by English Courts, ii 460; H. on recognition of judgments of in England, ii 476
Foreign subsidies, i 386, 439; policy of, i 387, ii 259; Hessian and Russian, ii 197, 237, 240, 243; Prussian, iii 135; attacked by Pitt, ii 198; adopted by Pitt, ii 362, 385
Foreign troops in British pay, numbers, 1759, iii 137
Forfeited estates in Scotland, Act for annexing to the Crown, i 600
Forfeiture for high treason, i 328–9
Forgery, made felony by statute, i 131
Forster, Rev. James, note on, i 575; account of Lord Kilmarnock's last moments, i 575
Fortescue, William, M.R., note on, eulogised by R. Savage, i 128
Fortescue-Aland, Sir John, note on, ii 540
Forthampton estate, acquired by James Yorke on his marriage, ii 578; value of, ii 597
Foster, Sir Michael, attitude towards the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 18 *n.*; correspondence with H. on publication of his *Reports*, ii 433; H.'s objections to, ii 434; reminded by H. of the Lords' standing order against, ii 434
Foster, Dr Nathaniel, ii 560
Fothergill, Mary, i 36
Fothergill, Thomas, Provost of Queen's College, i 36
Fouquet, General Heinrich, note on, Gen. Yorke's account of, iii 224–5; defeat of at Landshut, iii 153
Fowke, Governor of Gibraltar, conduct of,

ii 303; refuses to supply soldiers for relief of Minorca, ii 270; infatuated, ii 271 *n.*
Fox, George, the Quaker, pamphlet against John Billingsley, i 37 *n.*
Fox, Right Hon. Charles, hostility to the Marriage Act, ii 71
Fox, Henry, 1st Lord Holland, opposes militia grant, 1745, i 417; made Secretary at War, i 429; violent attack on the Marriage Act, ii 64 sqq.; attacks on the law, i 230 *n.*; compares the Court of Chancery to a spider's web, H. on, iii 462; reply to Charles Yorke's defence of H., ii 65, 70; H.'s severe retaliation upon, ii 66; conduct blamed, ii 70, 124, 131; rebuked by the King, ii 70; eulogised by Shebbeare in *The Marriage Act*, ii 63; hasty canvass of the ministry on H. Pelham's death, ii 188; hopes of being H. Pelham's successor, ii 187 sqq.; prospects injured by excessive forwardness, ii 188; his "mean submissions," ii 69; makes advances to H. and N., ii 211; sends apologising messages to H., ii 188, 206; pardoned by H., ii 188; calls upon Pitt on morning of H. Pelham's death, ii 205; hostility of Pitt to, ii 201; H.'s objections to his obtaining the chief power, ii 206; prevents him, ii 188 sqq.; opposition to, ii 188; offers of friendship to Col. J. Yorke, ii 281; Secretary of State, ii 191, 192, 208; resigns, ii 194, 212; intrigues to return to office, ii 219, 223; visits H., ii 222; power and following acquired, ii 187 sqq.; plays up to the King's partiality for the D. of Cumberland, opposes Regency Bill, ii 68 *n.*; joins the Duke of Cumberland's faction, ii 85–6, 187; gains the King's favour, ii 187 sqq., 211, 217; George II's praise of as "a brave fellow," iii 46, 48; alliance with Pitt in opposition, ii 194, 210, 219, 222; H. on, ii 282; has more powerful support than Pitt, ii 198, 248; H. forgives, ii 198; overtures to N. through Lord Granville, ii 235; claims to advancement urged by Lord Granville, ii 234 sqq.; threatens again to join the Opposition if not satisfied, ii 197, 235; obtains seat in the Cabinet and Council of Regency, ii 195; appointed Secretary of State and leader of the House of Commons, ii 198; ill consequences of, ii 197 sqq., 199; the King on his position in the Cabinet, ii 250; anger of the Princess of Wales at his advancement, ii 249; Princess of Wales' hostility to, ii 248; cause of, ii 249; treacherous conduct of in joining the Cabinet, ii 250, 275; Pitt breaks off alliance with, ii 195, 252; circular of on becoming leader of the House of Commons, ii 252; factious conduct in precipitating the war, ii 197, 199, 200 *n.*, 256, 258, 282; publishes secret expedition for Canada in the *Gazette*, ii 257; unpopularity of, ii 250; complains of H. and N. as overbearing, ii 382; proposal to exchange Gibraltar for Minorca, ii 305; N. opposed to, iii 166 *n.*; conversation with H. on public affairs, ii 330; proposes his own retirement to make way for Pitt, ii 330; on Byng's letters, ii 340 *n.*; refuses to defend N. at the Minorca crisis, ii 275, 290; declares the taking in of Pitt impracticable, ii 311; deserts the Government at the Minorca crisis, ii 275; repudiates all ambition and resentment, ii 326; resignation of, ii 331; reasons given for, ii 318 sqq.; endeavours to explain his resignation to H., ii 325, 328; H. on, ii 320; N.'s account of his conduct, ii 337; memorandum to the King explaining his resignation, ii 319; the King's indignation with, ii 321 sqq., 328; the King more inclined to than Pitt, ii 333; George II on taking in, ii 321; the D. of Cumberland's close friendship with, ii 328 *n.*, 362; directed to form an administration, ii 279; negotiates with the Duke of Bedford, ii 333; negotiates with Pitt, ii 323; desires to connect with Pitt, ii 328; advises a reconciliation with Leicester House or Pitt to be taken in, ii 330; Pitt refuses to form administration with, ii 279, 333; censure of Pitt on taking the administration, ii 360; moves for Parliamentary inquiry into loss of Minorca, ii 349, 361; inspires attack upon H. in *The Monitor*, ii 382; inspires *The Test*, ii 373 *n.*, 375; intrigues to remove Pitt from office, ii 365; eagerness to come into office, ii 387; promises the King to undertake the administration if Pitt is dismissed, ii 380; the King wishes for as minister, ii 366; applied to by the King to form an administration, ii 368; endeavours to gain N., ii 388–9; H. on, ii 393; cleverly manipulates the King's displeasure against N., ii 368; George II's desire to procure junction of with N., ii 384; prevented by H., ii 366; collapse of his administration, ii 368, 399; H. on, ii 390; George II insists upon the pay office for, ii 401, 404; Paymaster of the Navy, ii 370; gains and rewards of, ii 370; obtains reversions, ii 389; on N.'s retention of office at accession of George III, iii 261; on H., iii 262 *n.*; opinion of Pitt, ii 72 *n.*; on Pitt's policy of separate expeditions, iii 117; on Pitt's resignation, iii 288; H. and Andrew Stone on proposal to fill Pitt's place with, iii 328; alliance with Lord Bute, iii 257, 292; conditions of, iii 336; George III on, iii 370; made leader of the House of Commons, promised a peerage and retains his Paymastership of the Forces, iii 370; comments of

H., Duke of Cumberland, Fox, Duke of Devonshire on, iii 422 sqq.; on Bute's position, iii 419; delighted with his new situation, iii 423; influence on Bute's conduct and administration, iii 370; ingratitude to N., iii 445; proscribes N.'s followers, iii 377, 440 sqq.; D. of Cumberland on, the late Speaker Onslow consulted on, iii 446; institutes a "reign of terror," iii 378; urges Bute to turn out H.'s sons from their employments, iii 380, 451–2; treatment of Charles Yorke whilst Attorney-General, George III on, iii 549; bribery of, iii 378; conversation with the D. of Cumberland, iii 423; attempt to regain his friendship, iii 451; offer of command of the Army, iii 423; D. of Cumberland's displeasure with, iii 423; Princess Amelia's rage against, iii 401; rewards for his services, iii 458; created Lord Holland, iii 388; demand to be viscount in order to "stand before Pitt" refused, iii 388; quarrels with Lord Shelburne, Calcraft and Rigby, iii 388; end of, iii 388–9, 494; character and abilities, ii 71, 188; N. on, iii 426; H. has very bad opinion of, i 630, iii 418, 420; "a bad black man," ii 68; Lady Yarmouth's opinion of, ii 305; Bute on, iii 388; George II's character of, ii 304; superiority in debate, ii 168, 218; want of courage, ii 310; his clandestine marriage with Lady Caroline Lennox, ii 71; correspondence, ii 271, 320, 325, iii 380

France, British relations with, ii 149, 257; declaration of war, 1756, ii 258; negotiations, 1760, Gen. Yorke on, iii 244; desire for the separate negotiation without Prussia, iii 243; further negotiations, iii 293 sqq.; league with Russia and Austria against Frederick of Prussia, iii 127; treaty of Versailles with Austria, ii 274, iii 116; influence of alliance with Austria upon, iii 196; relations with Prussia broken off, ii 275; relations with Spain, 1761, iii 269, 282; total military forces of, 1748, i 632 *n.*; condition of, 1748, ii 1; great resources of, 1749, ii 173; expenditure of 1756–7, iii 158

Francis I (Grand Duke of Tuscany), emperor, i 388, 448, 625

Francklin, publisher of the *Craftsman*, prosecution of, i 82, 86

Franco v. *Alvares*, ii 486

Frankfurt, Union of, i 322

Fraser, Amelia, attempt of Simon Lord Lovat to kidnap, i 572

Fraser, Hugh, capture of, i 546; examination of, i 584; evidence of, i 582, 584

Fraser, John, ensign in the rebel army, false story of cruelties perpetrated upon, i 552

Fraser, Robert, evidence of, i 584, 586

Fraser, Simon, eldest son of Lord Lovat, note on, ii 383; military command given to, H.'s objections to, iii 29

Fraser, Thomas, of Beaufort, i 572

Fraud, in Common Law and in Equity, ii 450 *n.*; Common Law, statute and precedent overruled by H. on the ground of, ii 442; cause of increase in the business of the Court of Chancery, ii 554; no rules in equity concerning relief against, ii 554

Frauds, statute of, H. overrides in case of mistake, ii 451

Frazier, Col., killed at Culloden, i 524

Frederick, Prince of Wales, *see* Wales, Frederick, Prince of

Frederick II (the Great) of Prussia, British relations with, i 322, 632, 650, 659, iii 60; disputes with George II, i 186, ii 7; presses subject of George I's will, i 265; abortive project of alliance with, 1740, i 203; invades Silesia, i 203; rejects British alliance, i 245; makes Peace of Breslau, i 293; renews his alliance with France and attack upon Maria Theresa, i 322, 353; George II on plans of, i 350; favourable change of attitude towards England, 1744, on dismissal of Granville, i 379; rejects proposal of France to seize Hanover, iii 219; defeats Prince Charles of Lorraine at Hohenfriedberg, i 412; concludes Peace of Dresden with Austria, i 626; Convention of Hanover with, i 626, 634; reassured on the subject of Silesia by the British Government, i 653; instigates Jacobite plots in Scotland, i 538, 601 *n.*; letter of sympathy to the Young Pretender after Rebellion, ii 7; exorbitant views of, ii 30; obstructs election of King of the Romans, ii 4; Convention of Westminster with, ii 274; breaks off relations with France, ii 275; warns the English Government of the danger of French invasion, ii 380; European combination against, iii 127; warned by Col. Joseph Yorke of the designs against him, ii 153, iii 127; battle of Lobositz, ii 275; captures Saxon army at Pirna, ii 275; Pitt's letter to, ii 363; letter of thanks to Pitt, ii 363; military operations of 1757, iii 185; victory at Prague, iii 115; defeat at Kolin, ii 373, iii 115; danger of his situation, ii 380; despair of, iii 123; Mitchell on his desperate situation, iii 179; injurious effect upon of the Hanover Neutrality, iii 120, 178; answer to George II on being informed of the Hanover Neutrality, iii 121 *n.*, 180; urges George II to repudiate the Convention of Closterseven, iii 124; proposes scheme for D. of Cumberland's junction with his army, iii 174; begins a negotiation with Richelieu, iii 117, 123; victory at Rosbach, iii 119, 124; wins battle of Leuthen, iii 124; Col.

Yorke's advice to and communications with, iii 158; communications with Col. Yorke at the Hague regarding Holland, iii 127; approves of Col. J. Yorke's plan of landing troops at the mouth of the Elbe, iii 128; attitude of, 1758, iii 126; desire for despatch of British squadron to the Baltic refused, iii 129; Col. J. Yorke on, iii 201; alienated from England by the refusal to send reinforcements to Germany, iii 117, 126; on Pitt's refusal, iii 201; contemptuous references to Pitt, iii 117 *n.*, 131; refuses to accept the English subsidy or to sign the Convention, iii 117, 126 sqq.; Gen. Yorke's mission to, iii 129 sqq.; reception of Gen. Yorke, iii 199 sqq.; supports Mitchell and opposes his recall, iii 130 sqq., 199, 203, 209; declares that he will not be governed by Pitt, iii 131; consents to sign the Convention, iii 130; reasons for delay in signing, iii 200; reception of the offer of the British subsidy, iii 166; conferences with Gen. Yorke in 1758, iii 133, 200 sqq., 209 sqq.; friendly attitude towards England, iii 133; desire to secure Holland for the alliance, iii 135, 204, 213; military plans of 1758, iii 205; military operations of in 1758, iii 137; project of European alliances of, iii 204; views regarding the prosecution of the war and negotiations for peace, iii 212, 214; assurances of friendship and alliance with England, iii 218; hostility to France, iii 219; on best method of attacking France, iii 207; flatters Gen. Yorke with expectations of a campaign against France, iii 205, 209; on Pitt's policy of separate expeditions, iii 117 *n.*; desires British reinforcements for the Continent, iii 208; advises the system of demonstrations, iii 201; Col. Joseph Yorke's sanguine estimate of his chances of success, iii 197; parting words to Gen. Yorke, iii 213; on Gen. Yorke, iii 128, 134; satisfaction with Gen. Yorke, iii 133 sqq., 206 *n.*, 212, 213, 214; presents Gen. Yorke with his portrait, iii 134; Gen. Yorke's description of army of, iii 203, 210, 217, 221; Gen. Yorke on character of, iii 211, 218; Gen. Yorke on military genius of, iii 217, 221, 227; cordiality and good humour of, iii 203; person and habits, iii 209, 220; his table, iii 210; table talk of, iii 202, 208, 210, 211, 219; H. on precarious situation of, iii 196–7; military operations in 1759, iii 141; defeat at Kunersdorf, despair of, iii 141; declaration of Pitt against alliance with, iii 148; anxiety to procure peace, iii 146; supports the project of the conference, iii 146; attitude towards the separate negotiation between France and England, 1759, iii 146; refuses to make any concessions for the sake of a peace, iii 286, 297; sends personal message to Joseph Yorke of regard and confidence on the incident of the *Inconnue*, iii 26; campaign of 1760, iii 153; victories of Liegnitz and Torgau, iii 153; desire to secure a peace, iii 314; inclusion of in the negotiations for peace made a *sine qua non* by Pitt, iii 145; negotiations with France disapproved of by Pitt, iii 144, 244; on George II's death, iii 156; letter to Pitt, iii 313; campaign of 1761, iii 267; on Pitt's conduct of the negotiations, iii 285; urges the renewal of the separate negotiation, iii 267; desires negotiations to be made through Sir Joseph Yorke at the Hague, iii 268 *n.*; change in his situation owing to the death of the Czarina, iii 297; conduct of, 1762, H. on, iii 343; disappointing letter to George III, iii 298, 342; reserved attitude towards England, sharp retort to Sir Joseph Yorke's representations thereon, iii 297 sqq.; indignation at Bute's interview with Prince Galitzin, iii 296–7; indignation at Bute's negotiation with Austria, iii 296, 359; offers to guarantee Holstein to the Czar, iii 298, 347; describes the British ministers as lunatics, iii 298, 342; styled by Lord Granville George III's "greatest enemy," iii 355; and the British alliance and subsidy, iii 343 sqq.; H. on importance of, approves of the cancellation of Article IV, iii 300; agrees to cancellation of Article IV of the Treaty with England, iii 300; H. on imprudence of separating from, iii 345; Pitt, Sir Joseph Yorke, and N. against Bute's withdrawal, iii 301; Bute refuses the subsidy, iii 352; reasons of, iii 295 sqq.; attempts to organise opposition to Bute in England, iii 299; endeavours to gain Pitt's support, iii 299; military successes in 1762, iii 368; restitution of conquests from at Peace of Paris, iii 373; makes treaty of Hubertsburg with Austria, iii 373; correspondence, iii 128, 130, 134 *n.*, 141, 146–7, 156 *n.*, 211, 285, 298

Frederick William, King of Prussia, kidnapping of English Guardsmen, i 92

Frederick William, Prince, son of Frederick, Prince of Wales, baptism of, ii 93

Free Candid Disquisitions, ii 504

Freeman, Catherine, *see* Yorke, Hon. Mrs Charles

Freeman, Rev. Dr, correspondence, ii 590

Freeman, William, father of Charles Yorke's first wife, ii 574

Freeman v. *Bishop*, ii 467

French language in diplomacy discontinued in English despatches, 1753, ii 7 *n.*

French Protestant refugees, arrival at Dover, i 15

French troops in the Scottish Rebellion, i 511; hatred of the Highlanders, i

528; directed to surrender after Culloden, i 526
Freiburg, Prussian victory at, iii 368
Friesland, East, dispute concerning between Frederick of Prussia and George II, ii 7
Fuentes, Conde de, memorials of, iii 151, 275; H.'s approval of Pitt's answer to, iii 248, 250; conversation with Pitt, H. on, iii 319; intercepted correspondence with Grimaldi, iii 274, 277, 279, 282, 328; Wall's correspondence with, iii 283
Furnes, question of fortification of, i 631
Fury, Peregrine, of the Pay Office, ii 230

G

Gage, William, M.P. for Lewes, i 67
Gainham, Rev. John, marriage broker, ii 59
Galissonnière, La, naval battle with Byng, ii 295
Galitzin, Prince, Russian Ambassador in England, misrepresentation of Bute's interview with him, iii 296–7
Gally, Dr Henry, tract on reform of the marriage law, ii 60 *n.*
Galton v. *Hancock*, *see Gorton* v. *Hancock*
Gambling, gaming tables suppressed by H., ii 53, 108 sqq.; statute of 9 Anne, c. 14, against, i 126
Gansel, Captain, in campaign against the rebels of 1745, i 480
Gansel, Col., duel of, asks for H.'s approval of his conduct, ii 589; correspondence, ii 589
Gaol fever, i 80
Gardiner, Mr, counsel for the plaintiff in *Huckwell* v. *The Messengers of the Secretary of State*, iii 509
Garth v. *Sir John Hynde Cotton*, ii 449, 505
Gask, Lady, complains of depredations, i 536 *n.*
Geary, member of Byng's court-martial, ii 343 *n.*
George I, King of Great Britain, will of, i 265 *n.*
George II, King of Great Britain, and his father's will, i 265; addition by Walpole to his Civil List, H. on, iii 246; quarrel with the Prince of Wales, i 161; messages to the Prince of Wales, i 164, 169, 180; dismisses the Prince of Wales from the Palace, i 177; Hanoverian policy, i 203, 245 *n.*, 294, 443; dislike of Frederick II of Prussia, i 186, 632, 634; dispute with Frederick about East Friesland, ii 7; jealousy of the growth of the King of Prussia's power, ii 318, 380, 382; on debate for removal of Walpole, ii 253; at battle of Dettingen, i 297, 314 sqq.; gives electoral vote to Charles, Elector of Bavaria, i 318; rebukes the ministers for quarrelling, i 251; change of policy at Hanover, 1743, i 321; opposes the alliance with Holland, i 386; interviews and conversations with, i 347, 350, 366, 368; supports Lord Granville, i 335, 369, 385; defeated in contest about Lord Granville, i 379; complains of being "forced," i 391 *n.*; obliged to dismiss Lord Granville, i 336, iii 361; conversation with H., i 380; and Constitutional Government, i 379 sqq.; refuses to admit Pitt to office, i 379; hostility to Lord Chesterfield, i 389; obliged to admit opposition into the Government, advantages therefrom, H. on, iii 515; writes his own Speech, i 335; anger with the Pelhams, i 379, 385; alarmed for Hanover, i 390; obstructs measures for suppressing the Rebellion, i 417, 454; opposes recall of troops from Flanders, i 635; ill effects of his conduct, i 416 sqq.; at last alarmed, i 458; proposal to make Pitt Secretary at War, iii 65; "ministry of 40 hours," i 426; obliged to reinstate ministers, i 427, 504; against D'Argenson's proposals for peace, i 636; attitude towards the peace, i 628, 665; meeting with the Princess of Orange, i 656; separate schemes in Hanover, i 632, ii 5; Osnaburg negotiation of, i 658, 662; delays return to England from Hanover, ii 103; refuses to support Convention of Hanover, i 635; opposes subsidy to Elector Palatine, ii 35; rage with Lord Harrington, ii 107; dissatisfaction with the D. of Cumberland, ii 171; delighted with George, Prince of Wales, ii 43 *n.*; objects to the Council of Regency "swearing to the people," ii 112; inclination towards the Bedford and Cumberland faction, ii 41, 47, 87; approves H.'s retaliation upon Fox, ii 70; separate Hanoverian negotiations of, ii 35 sqq.; remarks upon Walpole's and H. Pelham's finance, ii 6; hostility to Pitt, ii 206, 211, 215; partiality for Fox, ii 206, 217; prevents Pitt's inclusion in the Cabinet, ii 187 sqq.; conversation on Fox and Pitt, ii 221; conversation concerning leadership of the House of Commons, ii 217; displeased with N., ii 223 sqq.; last visit to Hanover against the ministers' entreaties, ii 238, 258, 284; conversation on Fox's position in the Cabinet, ii 250; hostility to Pitt, ii 236; consents reluctantly to Pitt's inclusion in the Cabinet, ii 196, 238–9; refuses to speak to Pitt, ii 250; conversation on the factious conduct of the Princess of Wales, ii 254; consents to appointment of Bute as Groom of the Stole to the Prince of Wales, ii 314; conversation on Braddock's defeat, ii 285; conversation on Lord Bute and Fox, ii 304; on Byng, ii 270 *n.*; and affair of the Hanoverian soldier, ii 278; offended at Fox's memorandum, ii 319; on the alternatives

of taking in Fox or Pitt, ii 321; more inclined to Fox than Pitt, ii 333; Pitt "will not do his German business," ii 321; consents to Pitt being offered the Secretaryship of State, ii 322; declines Pitt's proposals, ii 278, 332; will not allow Lady Yarmouth to meddle in politics, ii 332, iii 61; dissatisfaction with his new ministers, ii 373; Pitt's promises of further supplies for Germany, ii 364; dislikes Pitt's oratorical harangues, ii 364; refuses the King's Speech written by Pitt, ii 373; antipathy to Lord Temple, ii 364; Lord Temple's insolence to, ii 365; refuses to pardon Byng, ii 342–3; reply to Pitt urging Byng's reprieve, ii 344 *n.*; "in horrid humour," ii 388; dismisses Pitt, ii 365; wishes for Fox as minister, ii 366; on unreasonableness of Pitt and Bute, ii 367; desire for the return of the old ministers, ii 395; desires N. to form another administration, ii 365, 367; desires N. to join with Fox, ii 384, 387; displeasure at N.'s refusal, ii 368, 388; on H.'s conduct, ii 388; conversation with Lord Mansfield on H. and N., ii 394; applies to Lord Waldegrave and Fox to form administration, ii 368; dissuaded by Lord Mansfield from proceeding further, ii 368, 399; orders H. to settle an administration, ii 368; heated interview with H., ii 369, 401, 403; obliged to change his ministers and thanks H. for advising, iii 468; gives H. leave to bring in Pitt, ii 369; wishes concerning the constitution of the new ministry, ii 401, 404; desires reinstatement of Lord Anson, ii 401, 403, 404; satisfaction at H.'s settlement of the Pitt-Newcastle administration, ii 404; instructions to the D. of Cumberland in Hanover, H. on, iii 120 sqq., 167, 182 sqq.; D'Abreu's misrepresentation of, H. on, iii 194; Pitt and H. on, iii 122 *n.*; on the defeat at Hastenbeck, iii 161; decides on a neutrality for Hanover, iii 161 sqq.; negotiates as Elector with France and Austria, iii 120, 172 sqq., 174; urged not to make a separate Hanoverian peace, iii 121; indignation at the D. of Cumberland's conduct in concluding the Convention of Closterseven, iii 180 sqq.; reflections upon the D. of Cumberland's courage, iii 180 sqq., 191–2; tears and distress of, iii 170; begs N. to help him, iii 174; repudiates Convention of Closterseven, iii 193; reception of the D. of Cumberland on his return from Hanover, iii 122, 188; attempt of the D. of Cumberland's faction to bully and throw the blame on, iii 189; relents towards the D. of Cumberland, iii 189; desires the return of the D. of Cumberland to his offices, iii 191; refuses to give the Garter to Lord Temple, iii 23, 57 sqq.; "forced" to give it, iii 26, 64 sqq; Lord Temple apologises to, iii 26; H.'s satisfaction at, iii 90; generous support of Gen. Yorke in the affair of the *Inconnue*, iii 107; approval of Joseph Yorke's conduct, iii 26; wishes to remove Granville and Pitt and give offices to H. and C. Yorke, iii 46, 48; wishes Gen. Yorke to succeed Pitt as Secretary of State, iii 79; hopes to turn out Pitt and take in Fox, iii 46, 48; rejects proposal to renew negotiations for Hanover Neutrality, iii 124 *n.*; discontent at his electoral situation, iii 230, 242; anger at N.'s refusal of his demand for money, iii 40; on the battle of Minden, iii 234; anger at refusal of the ministers to secure *dédommagements* for Hanover, iii 91; displeasure with Pitt, iii 57 sqq.; dislikes Pitt's "eloquence," iii 63; conversation with N. on Pitt, iii 72; wishes to "take a bark and go to Hanover," iii 60; death of, ii 582, iii 154; N., H., and Gen. Yorke on, iii 253–4; consequences of, iii 255 sqq.; character of, iii 107, 154; preference for Hanover to England, ii 284 *n.*; partiality for his Hanoverian troops, i 320; care in granting peerages, ii 302; keeps his Generals' secrets, iii 234; sympathy for H. and his family on Lady Anson's death, ii 594; affection for Joseph Yorke, ii 596; "loves reprisals," ii 70; fondness for money, iii 246; H. on, iii 41; ill humour of, ii 119; H. on allowances to be made for, iii 110; regard for H., iii 233; on humanity to the rebel Lords, i 569; just severity in Lord George Sackville's case, iii 141; in Byng's case, ii 343; on Pitt's ignorance of the way to treat Kings, iii 131 *n.*; on the best way to deal with Pitt, iii 58; on "the humour of this country," i 504; great features of his reign, iii 156; the golden age of the Nonconformists, ii 73; Charles Yorke's defence of, in the House of Commons, iii 301, 339; notes of, i 527, 652, ii 167, iii 210; correspondence, ii 402

George III, King of Great Britain, character of, iii 258; George II delighted with, ii 43 *n.*; unfortunate circumstances of his education, ii 45; allowed to remain with his mother, ii 275, 314; educated on Bolingbroke's principles, ii 45; "English" education of, iii 258; confused notions of geography, iii 414; deplorable training of, iii 256 sqq.; disputes of his governors, ii 47; in the hands of others, as his father, ii 314, 315; becomes centre of intrigues against the administration, ii 200; estrangement from George II, ii 307; complimented by H. when taking notes in the H. of Lords, ii 260;

reflections upon H., ii 297; called an imbecile by Princess Amelia, ii 307; support and patronage of Lord George Sackville, ii 384, iii 119, 140, 257; presses for appointment of Lord Bute as Groom of the Stole, ii 200; delight at his appointment, ii 314; induced to reject project of marriage with Princess Sophia of Brunswick, ii 200; accession of, iii 304 sqq.; circumstances of, iii 258; plan to destroy party and establish monarchical government, iii 256 sqq., 259; hostility to the Whig party, iii 256; first interview with N. and Pitt after his accession, iii 304–5; gives assurances of support to N., iii 262; presses N. to remain in office, iii 306; receives H. graciously, iii 307; gives Charles Yorke assurance of support, iii 260, 305, 307; conducts all business through Lord Bute, iii 262, 304; identifies himself with Lord Bute, H. on, iii 264; declaration to the Council at his accession, Pitt's objection to, iii 262, 305; addition to the King's Speech, iii 262; "I glory in the name of Britain," iii 262; marriage of, iii 264; Pitt's audience of, iii 315; declines Pitt's paper of protest and defers decision regarding war with Spain, iii 325; resentment at Pitt's triumphal procession into the city, iii 496; Frederick's letter to, iii 298; disappointing character of, iii 342; N.'s appeal to not to abandon the German war, iii 341; interview with N., iii 356; takes part against N., iii 353; recovery from illness, iii 397; overtures to N., iii 406; discusses the terms of peace with N., iii 370, 413; further overtures to H. and N., iii 423, 424, 429; names Charles Yorke as successor to Lord Henley, iii 367, 408 sqq.; recognition of Charles Yorke's former surrender of his "just pretensions," iii 366; on the alliance of Bute and Fox, iii 370; expulsion of the D. of Devonshire from office, iii 370, 428 sqq.; conduct towards the Princes of Brunswick, iii 258, 369; bad reception of at opening of Parliament Nov. 1762, iii 384; Duke of Cumberland expresses his disapprobation of the terms of peace to, iii 419; complains of tumults in the country, iii 550; loses his confidence in Bute, iii 384; demeanour on Bute's resignation, iii 457–8; resentment at Wilkes's discharge, iii 495; determined to proscribe the Whigs, iii 388; refuses to admit an opposition party, iii 468, 470; H. on, iii 515; will never admit N. into office, iii 429; or Pitt and Temple, iii 458; H. on, iii 496; prefers the Devil to George Grenville, iii 467; Bute's resumption of influence over, iii 508; urged by the D. of Bedford to summon Pitt to office, iii 471; Pitt's negotiation with, iii 523 sqq.; H. on, iii 531; object of, iii 469; makes capital of, iii 470, 537; communicates to Charles Yorke Pitt's neglect of him in the recent negotiations and promises him a peerage if he retains office, iii 471, 537; conversations with G. Grenville and Sir J. Phillips on the negotiation with Pitt, iii 469–70; on Pitt as a tyrant, iii 536; censures Pitt's overbearing temper, iii 54; embarrassing situation of, iii 470; continues policy of intrigue, iii 470; Charles Yorke's parting interview with, iii 474–5, 548; on Fox's treatment of Charles Yorke whilst attorney-general, iii 549; supports Lord Sandwich's candidature for the High Stewardship of Cambridge University, iii 257; H.'s resentment at, iii 484, 485 *n.*, 561; gives pension to Shebbeare, iii 258; increase of Irish Civil List after accession of, iii 378
George, Lake, British victory at, ii 258
Geraldino, Sir Thomas (Fitzgerald) Spanish Envoy, i 186, 217, 218
German war, as a "diversion" to France, Col. Joseph Yorke urges, iii 157–8
Gertruydenberg, negotiation at, compared with negotiations 1759–63, iii 150; *see also* Utrecht, Treaty of
Ghent, British troops at, i 299; capture by the French, i 388, 413
Gibbon, Alice, i 34
Gibbon, Catherine, i 34
Gibbon, Cordelia, i 34
Gibbon, Deborah, death of, i 33, 34; dispute with Mrs Elizabeth Yorke, i 39
Gibbon, Dorothy, i 34
Gibbon, Edward, father of the historian, i 34
Gibbon, Edward, the historian, relationship to the Chancellor, i 32; last of the Gibbons, i 33; pedigree, i 34
Gibbon, Edward, 1st husband of Elizabeth Yorke, i 32, 34, 36
Gibbon, Elizabeth, mother of the Chancellor, *see* Yorke, Elizabeth
Gibbon, Elizabeth, née Philipott, i 32, 34
Gibbon, Elizabeth, *see* Eaton, Elizabeth
Gibbon, Elizabeth, i 34
Gibbon, Hester, i 34
Gibbon, Jane, *see* Brydges, Jane
Gibbon, John, i 34
Gibbon, Judith, i 34
Gibbon, Martha, i 34
Gibbon, Margaret, i 34
Gibbon, Mary, i 34
Gibbon, Matthew, i 34
Gibbon, Philip, i 31, 32, 34
Gibbon, Philip (Richard), half brother to the Chancellor, i 32, 34, 36, 39
Gibbon, Richard, i 31, 33, 34, 36
Gibbon, Col. Robert, of Rolvenden, i 32
Gibbon, Thomas, of Westcliffe, i 31, 34
Gibbon family of Westcliffe and of Rolvenden, Co. Kent, i 31

Gibbons of Westcliffe, pedigree, i 34; extinction of, i 33
Gibbons of Rolvenden, extinction of, i 33
Gibraltar, Fox's proposal to exchange for Minorca, ii 305, iii 166 *n.*; Pitt's proposal for ceding to Spain, iii 116, 123, 165; H.'s doubts of the wisdom of, iii 123, 168
Gibson, Edmund, bishop of London, proposal to extend ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the colonies, i 90; complaint of "Orator" Henley, i 91; dispute with Lord Chancellor Talbot, i 127; writings censured by H., i 149; prudence and judgment of, ii 81
Gibson v. *Lord Montfort*, decree of H. re-heard, ii 478
Gilbert v. *Chudleigh*, ii 474
Gillis, Grand Pensionary of Holland, opposes despatch of troops to England at Rebellion, i 635
Gilmour, Sir Alexander, iii 503
Gin Act, 1736, i 131, 133, 138
Gin traffic, measures controlling, ii 52
Glanville, repudiation of as legal authority, ii 486
Glasgow, population of, before the Rebellion, i 602 *n.*
Glatz, Frederick of Prussia loses, iii 153
Glenorchy, Lord; *see* Breadalbane, 3rd Earl of
Glover, Richard, note on, ii 252; hostility to and abuse of H., ii 266; on H.'s opposition to the Militia Bill, ii 265 *n.*; on the formation of the Pitt-Newcastle ministry, ii 371; political activity of, iii 387; supporter of Lord Bute in the city, iii 395; quoted, ii 278 *n.*
Glynn, John, Serjeant-at-Law, note on, counsel for plaintiff in *Huckwell* v. *Messengers of the Secretary of State*, iii 509; argument as counsel for Wilkes, iii 493
Goddard, Thomas, i 11
Goddin, John, i 28, 30
Godolphin, Francis, 2nd Earl of, i 232 and *n.*, 233, 180; letters of H., i 109 sqq.
Golowkin, Count, Russian ambassador at the Hague, intimacy of Joseph Yorke with, ii 154, 182 sqq.; gives information to Joseph Yorke of the European combination against Frederick of Prussia, iii 127–8
Goodrick, Sir John, British Envoy to Sweden, note on, iii 206; accompanies Gen. Yorke to the K. of Prussia, iii 130; correspondence, iii 206 *n.*
Gordon, 3rd Duke of, escapes from Gordon Castle, i 512
Gordon, Lord George, asks for exchange of prisoners, i 517
Gordon, Sir James, in the case of *Gordon of Park*, ii 542
Gordon, John, prosecution of, i 62
Gordon, Captain John, of Park, case of, ii 434
Gordon, Sir William, attainder of, ii 482; in the case of *Gordon of Park*, ii 542
Gordon of Park, appeal case of, ii 482; H. objects to the publication of, ii 434; H. on grounds of the judgment, ii 541
Gordons, join the Y. Pretender, i 451
Gorée, capture of, iii 137; surrendered by Peace of Paris, iii 374
Gorton (*or Galton*) v. *Hancock*, ii 424, 479, 498
Göttingen, unsuccessful attempt of Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick upon, iii 153
Government of the Mind, essay on by H., i 103
Gower, 1st Earl, i 307; rebuked in the H. of Lords by H., i 327; rejects overtures from Granville and the Prince of Wales, i 336; moderate conduct in 1745, i 391 *n.*; resigns, i 499
Gower, 2nd Earl, and the Fox-Waldegrave fiasco, ii 399; on the proscription of N.'s supporters, iii 445; left by Bute in 1763 as his substitute in the ministry, iii 494; position in George Grenville's administration, iii 498
Gower v. *Grosvenor and Piggot*, ii 429
Grace, re, ii 474
Grafton, Charles, 2nd Duke of, note, i 229, 162, 165, 176, 182; N.'s anger with, i 110–11; opposes Convention of Hanover, i 323; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 333; supporter of Fox, ii 188 *n.*; to gain over the D. of Devonshire from Fox, ii 304; friendship for H., ii 383
Grafton, Augustus, 3rd Duke of, on Bute's appointment as Secretary of State, iii 265; on defeat of the opposition to the Peace, iii 376; pressing for opposition, iii 438; deprived of his Lord Lieutenancy, iii 377, 448; ministry of, ii 220 *n.*; reinstates victims of Bute's proscriptions, iii 378; correspondence, iii 288, 340 *n.*
Grammont, Duc de, responsibility for French defeat at Dettingen, i 315
Granby, Lord, supports defence of late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 359; situation of in 1763, iii 368; tact of, iii 400; Gen. Yorke on, iii 237
Grant, Colonel, killed in attack on Fort St Lazar, i 257
Grant, Sir Ludovic, votes for Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 606
Grant, William, of Prestongrange, Lord Advocate, note on, i 551; support of Scottish reforms censured by Duncan Forbes, i 612; correspondence, i 551, ii 335
Grant, Sir William, remarks on H.'s decree in *Mead* v. *Orrery*, ii 493 *n.*
Grant clan, i 449
Granville, Earl (Lord Carteret), character and talents, i 282; levity of, i 430; H. Pelham's opinion of, ii 34–5; H.'s opinion of, i 631; drunken enthusiasm at the

Council, ii 34, 234; talked better sense drunk than sober, ii 234 *n.*; his "secret of cowing" H., as reported by Lord Shelburne, ii 70 *n.*; supports the Prince of Wales's faction, i 168 *n.*, 177; urges on the war with Spain, i 194; speaks on the Convention with Spain, i 188, 189 *n.*; moves resolution for Walpole's removal, i 199; overtures of ministers to, 1742, i 318; becomes Secretary of State on fall of Walpole, i 279; fails in 1743 to secure chief power, i 281; coldness of Lord Bath towards, ii 168; opposes bill to impeach Walpole, i 289; Lord Orford warns the Pelhams against, i 340; connection with the Duke of Argyll, i 305; advances of the Tories to, i 307; pays court to the King, i 319; follows the K.'s Hanoverian policy, i 386; supports grant for Hanoverian troops, i 292, 293; hostile attitude to Frederick of Prussia, i 379; accompanies troops abroad, i 292; mission to the States, i 308; prevents permanent treaty of neutrality between Hanover and France, i 318; and Lord Stair, i 307; military instructions to Lord Stair, i 314; loses advantages of Dettingen, i 321 sqq.; Treaty of Hanau, i 321, 323, 337, 339, 359; speech in cabinet in support of, i 324; rhodomontade in support of his foreign policy, i 326; conduct on being passed over for the chief power, i 337; overbearing conduct of, i 320; instructions to generals abroad, 1744, i 355; increased differences with the ministers, i 330; conduct of and unpopularity, i 331; conduct towards the ministers, i 376; George II's support of, i 335, 385; disapproves of negotiations with the Dutch, i 343 *n.*; defeat of his foreign policy, i 325; struggle for predominance, 1744, i 344, 353, 357, 360, 366; overtures to the Tories to prevent his dismissal, i 336, 375; defeat of, i 319 sqq.; obliged to resign, i 336, 373; attitude after resigning, i 374; commends convention with Prussia, i 455; influence with George II on outbreak of the Rebellion, i 416; flattery of George II, i 453; a "vile sycophant," i 448; treats Rebellion as of no importance, i 450; obstructs government measures, i 418; opposes summoning British troops from Flanders, i 455; refuses to subscribe towards national defence, i 418; changes his attitude after Prestonpans, i 460; failure to regain power, 1746, i 429, 499, 508; minister of 40 hours, i 426; comments of, i 504, 507; direction of *The Fool*, i 639; supports a complaint of Lord Lovat, i 574, 578; supports Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 614; overtures to from Duke of Bedford, ii 114; N. supports his reappointment to office, ii 100 sqq.; disapproved of by H. Pelham, ii 101; appointed Lord President of the Council, ii 42, 102 sqq., 112; does not attend debates on Mutiny Bill, ii 86; abstains from opposing Marriage Bill, ii 66; present at cabinet meeting on death of Henry Pelham, ii 191; urges advancement of Fox upon N., ii 234 sqq.; on alternatives of taking in Pitt or Fox, ii 321; endeavours to persuade Fox to retract his resignation, ii 323; remains President of the Council through changes of government, ii 280, 370; declines to advise the K. at the Hanoverian crisis, iii 161; speaks in the H. of Lords on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 17; Lord Lyttelton on his conduct in supporting the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 17 *n.*; "eternizes" himself, iii 49, 50; George II wishes to remove from office, iii 46, 48, 52; opposes H.'s memorandum to Prince Louis of Brunswick for the inclusion of Gen. Yorke in his negotiation, iii 95; on Pitt, ii 383; on Pitt's "madness," ii 367; supports H. and N. in the cabinet against Pitt, iii 321; speeches at cabinet meetings, iii 272, 276, 277, 280; supports Bute's withdrawal of the Prussian subsidy, iii 352 *n.*; calls Frederick of Prussia George III's "greatest enemy," iii 355; opposes Bute's peace policy in the Council, iii 406; his veneration for H., i 214 *n.*; praise of H.'s sons and their surprising abilities, ii 578; death of, iii 468

Graves, Mr, Alderman of Cambridge, ii 162

Gravestones, essay on by Sir P. Yorke, i 102

Gravina, cited by H., ii 446

Gray, Thomas, describes apathy of the people at Rebellion, i 419 *n.*

Great Seal, affixed by the King alone to a Commission, i 152

Green, John, Bishop of Lincoln, contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 207

Green, V., on Lady Hardwicke, ii 565 *n.*

Green v. *Rutherford*, ii 463

Grenada, capture of, iii 295

Grenville, George, note on, ii 203; Pitt on his parliamentary ability, ii 215; pedantic loquacity of, iii 397; prolixity and disputatiousness, H. on, iii 333; George III prefers the Devil to, iii 467; Lord Bute on abilities of, iii 385; Lord Mansfield's regard for, iii 400; Charles Yorke's reported opinion of, iii 474; joins the Leicester House faction, ii 200; one of Frederick, Prince of Wales's prospective ministers, ii 42; made Treasurer of the Navy, ii 212; dismissed, ii 198; Paymaster of the Navy, ii 280; supports attack on late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 359; Treasurer to the Navy, ii 370, iii 1; supports Pitt in his attack upon the law and the Judges, iii 4, 5; opposes bill for increasing the Judges' salaries, iii 20; interview with H., iii

333; abandons his connection with Lord Temple and Pitt, iii 292; raises opposition in the Treasury against N., iii 356; Lord Bute on, iii 405; made leader of the H. of Commons with a seat in the Cabinet, H. on, iii 292, 330; *verba sonantia* of added to the King's speech, iii 294, 336; speech in the debate on the Address, 1761, iii 338; desires to abandon the German war, iii 341, 347, 397; supports Bute's withdrawal of the Prussian subsidy, iii 352 *n.*; Secretary of State, iii 360; H.'s conversation with, iii 397; uneasiness in his situation, iii 336; cannot "stand Mr Pitt's fire," iii 422; insists on an equivalent for Havannah, iii 368, 374, 418; removed from the leadership of the H. of Commons and made First Lord of the Admiralty, iii 370; H. on, iii 422; made First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, iii 388; H. on, iii 458; Charles Yorke on his unfitness for the chief power, iii 386; Pitt on, iii 487; composition of his ministry, iii 498; on H.'s rejection of the offers from the Court, iii 468; authority of weakened by the triumph of Wilkes, iii 468; amazed at the apparition of Pitt's chair at Buckingham House, iii 469; situation after the negotiations with Pitt, iii 470; George III's conversation with, iii 469; shakes off Bute's influence, iii 467; insists on Bute's banishment, iii 528; opposes recall of Sir Joseph Yorke, iii 475 *n.*; on Charles Yorke and Pitt's estrangement, iii 477; on Charles Yorke's resignation, iii 474; on Charles Yorke's speech in the H. of Commons against the Privilege, iii 478; reply to Charles Yorke's advice to take in the opposition, iii 479; correspondence, ii 265, iii 284, 285, 374 *n.*, 398

Grenville, Lady Hester, marriage to Pitt, ii 137

Grenville, James, note on, ii 227, iii 166; resigns the Board of Trade, ii 198; account of Charles Yorke's conference with Pitt, ii 196 *n.*; a Lord of the Treasury, ii 280, 370, iii 1

Grey, Lady Amabel, Lady Glenorchy, i 209

Grey, Amabel, Countess de, *see* Yorke, Lady Amabel

Grey, Jemima, Marchioness, i 209; described, i 211; birth of her second child, ii 585–6; verses to by Lady Margaret Yorke, ii 158; correspondence, i 552

Grey, Thomas, 2nd Earl de, i 209

Grierson, Rev. —, convicted of solemnising marriages illegally, ii 64 *n.*

Griffin, Captain, i 226

Grimaldi, Geronimo, Marquis of, Spanish minister at Paris, intercepted correspondence with Fuentes, iii 274, 277, 279, 282, 328; correspondence with Abreu, iii 122 *n.*; influence with Choiseul and over the course of the negotiations, iii 337

Grimaldo, José, Marquis of (Grimaldi), Spanish minister, reported corruption of, ii 26

Gross Jägersdorf, Russian victory at, iii 124

Grotius, admits oaths to false gods, ii 458

Guadaloupe, capture of, iii 138; surrendered at Peace of Paris, iii 374

Guardians, relations with wards, ii 468

Gunman, Capt. James, advised by H. to avoid the perils of a 2nd marriage, ii 563, 582; shows civilities to Charles Yorke at Dover, ii 164; correspondence, ii 582

Gunman family at Dover, friendship with H., ii 563

Gyles v. *Wilcox*, ii 464

H

Habeas Corpus, Act of, suspension of, i 327, iii 3; defect in, iii 12; Bill of 1758, iii 42 sqq.; debate in the H. of Commons, iii 4 sqq.; absurdities of, iii 9, 16; Lord Lyttelton on, iii 4; Pitt's arguments for, iii 43; H. opposes and causes rejection of, iii 6 sqq., 17; intrigue to prevent the Judges answering H.'s questions, iii 51; H. proposes a new measure, iii 18; carried into law, 1816, iii 19; writ of, by common law and by statute, iii 2 sqq.; limitations of, iii 7 sqq.; of right but not of course, iii 8; judicial procedure in granting, iii 2 sqq.

Haddenham, inhabitants of, thanks of to H. for benevolence, ii 568

Haddock, Nicholas, admiral, note on, i 223; failure to intercept Spanish fleet, i 203; conduct criticised, i 197; return from the Mediterranean countermanded, i 228

Hadik, General Andreas, Count, note on, raid on Berlin, iii 228

Haldane, Solicitor-General of Scotland, ability of, i 622

Hale, Sir Matthew, Lord Chief Justice, on natural developement of law, ii 487; on origin of equity jurisdiction, ii 551; distinctions in kinds of madness, ii 573; contradicts dictum of Sir Ed. Coke excluding evidence of infidel witnesses, ii 458–9; on securing of indemnity to a felon by accusing another, i 290; on the writ of Habeas Corpus, iii 10

Hales, Sir T., visits Charles Yorke at Dover, ii 164

Hales, William, prosecution of, i 79

Halifax, George Montague Dunk, 2nd Earl of, note on, ii 409, i 473; President of the Board of Trade, ii 280, 370; Secretary of State, iii 370, 388; thanked

by Frederick of Prussia, iii 373; sole supporter of Bute in the Council, iii 419; proposes by George III's command H.'s and N.'s return to office, iii 423; announces to N. his dismissal from his lieutenancies, iii 447; H.'s conversation with on Bute's resignation, iii 457; insists on Bute's banishment, iii 528; one of the triumvirate in George Grenville's administration, iii 498; issues general warrant for arrest of printers and publishers of the *North Briton*, iii 460; conduct and responsibility in arrest of Wilkes, iii 480 *n.*

Hamilton, William Gerard, "single-speech," note on, ii 250; note of, i 161, ii 280 *n.*

Hamilton, Capt. Thomas, description of Rebels, 1745, i 415 *n.*

Hammond, —, corrupt Southwark magistrate, ii 109

Hamon[d], James, of Dover, i 15

Hanau, Convention of, i 321 sqq., 357, 359; opinion of Bolingbroke and the Tories of, i 377; difficulties with Austria caused by, i 337, 339

Hanover, Frederick rejects French proposal to seize, iii 219; Pitt's policy of abandoning during the war, ii 232, 234, 236–7, 240, 275; Pitt adopts the policy of the late ministry concerning, ii 363; occupation by the French 1757, iii 119

Hanover, Convention of, i 626, 634 sqq.; obligations under, ii 24 *n.*

Hanover, Treaty of, i 200, 201; H.'s disapproval of, ii 14; results of, i 659, ii 29–30

Hanoverian neutrality, 1741, i 203; opposition of ministers to, i 259; acquiesced in by Walpole, i 191

Hanoverian neutrality, 1757, rumours of, ii 387; fatal policy of, iii 120; decided upon by George II, iii 161 sqq.; Col. Joseph Yorke on, iii 120, 159, 170; N.'s endeavour to dissuade the K. from, iii 172; N. on mischievous results of, iii 164 sqq.; H. on mischiefs of, iii 164 sqq.; H. endeavours to dissuade George II from, iii 173; Pitt repudiates all share in, iii 173

Hanoverian policy, i 203, 243, 245 *n.*, 259 sqq., 273, 318 sqq., 337, 345, 632, 634 sqq., ii 35 sqq.; the Osnaburg negotiation, i 658, 662, ii 5; fatal results of, iii 120; end of, iii 113, 124

Hanoverian question, the nature of, causes and consequences, i 293 sqq.; H. on, ii 260

Hanoverian soldier, affair of the, ii 278; Pitt on, ii 376

Hanoverian troops, in British pay, i 292, 296, 319, 386, 388; opposition to, i 341; employed in England, ii 261

Harcourt, Lord Chancellor, on imprudence of *obiter dicta*, ii 493

Hardinge, George, i 52

Hardinge, Nicholas, note on, ii 316; friendship with H., ii 564 *n.*

Hardwicke, Philip Yorke, Earl of, *see* Yorke, Philip, Earl of Hardwicke

Hardwicke in Gloucestershire, legacy of H. to, iii 486

Hardwicke estate, i 43, 107; value of, ii 307

"Hardwicke," the, iii 125 *n.*

Hardwicke Papers, The, see *Miscellaneous State Papers*

Hardy, Admiral Sir Charles, brought forward by Anson, iii 114

Hargrave, Francis, MS. notes of, ii 432; note on H.'s final decree in *Gorton* v. *Hancock*, ii 479 *n.*; on power of courts of equity to dispense with rules of law, ii 442; admiration for Charles Yorke, ii 145

Harley, Edward, opposes motion for removal of Walpole, i 253

Harrach, Count, i 300 *n.*

Harrington, William, 1st Earl of, Secretary of State, note on, i 114, 165, 336; acquiesces in George II's Hanoverian policy, i 203, 243, 261, 265, 269; and the Hanoverian Neutrality, i 273; influence with the King against the ministers, i 228; N.'s complaints of, i 251; firm reply to Frederick of Prussia, i 245; President of the Council, gained over by the ministers from the King, i 337; opposes Convention of Hanau, i 323; George II endeavours to gain for support of Lord Granville, i 369; supports the Pelhams against Granville, i 371; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 366; on plan of campaign, 1744, i 355; succeeds Lord Granville as Secretary of State, i 336; insists upon the K. supporting the Convention of Hanover, i 635; refuses to support the K. in the ministerial crisis, i 427; resigns and is reinstated, i 499; approves D'Argenson's proposals for peace, i 627, 636; objects to N.'s private foreign correspondence, i 638 *n.*, iii 22 *n.*; resigns, i 637; made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, i 628; the K.'s hatred of, i 638, ii 106; want of parliamentary talents, i 372

Harris, James, of Salisbury, i 69

Harris, Mr, iii 477

Harrison v. *Bush*, iii 463 *n.*

Harte, Walter, aided by the 2nd Lord H., ii 146

Haslang, Count Joseph, i 360

[*Haslang*] *Haislaing, Re Count*, ii 464

Hassell, Mr, attack upon his house by militia rioters, iii 32

Hastenbeck, defeat of the D. of Cumberland at, iii 119, 160 sqq.

Hatton, Sir Christopher, appointment of as Lord Chancellor, ii 421

Hatton, Lady, house besieged by militia rioters, iii 35

Havannah, conquest of, planned by Anson,

iii 295, 373, 418; H. on, iii 417; N. on importance of, iii 419; Bute embarrassed by, iii 368, 419; exchanged for Florida at Peace of Paris, iii 374
Havre, bombarded by Rodney, iii 138
Havrincourt, Marquis d', Choiseul's letter to, iii 341
Hawke, Sir Edward, note on, iii 215; victory off Belleisle, 1747, i 625; N.'s doubts of the wisdom of orders given to, 1754, ii 283; capture of French ships and men, 1755, ii 258; desire of Anson and H. to include in Board of Admiralty, ii 405, iii 31; operations of, 1758, iii 126; opinion of expedition against Rochefort as practicable, iii 189; neglects Anson's instructions to avoid councils of war, iii 186; conduct censured by Anson, iii 215; opposes Pitt's expedition against Belleisle, iii 253, 267; recommends Wolfe for promotion, iii 114 *n.*; victory in Quiberon Bay, iii 138
Hawkins, Mr, attends Mrs Charles Yorke, ii 590
Hawkins, Rev. —, attacks the Marriage Act, ii 133, 136
Hawley, General Henry, noted for his severity, i 468; defeated at Falkirk, i 426; at Culloden, i 523
Hay, Lord Charles, i 463
Hay, George, Lord of the Admiralty, note on, testimony to Lord Anson's merits, iii 160, ii 404 *n.*
Haye, Dr, iii 55
Hayter, Thomas, bishop of Norwich, insulted in his diocese owing to the Jew Bill, ii 56; translation to London, iii 319
Hayward, Carlton, H.'s clerk, appointed to Clerkship of the Briefs, ii 118
Head, Sir Francis, disputes with his wife, ii 466
Hearle v. *Greenbank*, ii 505 *n.*
Hearne v. *Hearne*, ii 480 *n.*
Heathcote, Alderman, M.P., leader of the Jacobites in London, 1745, i 424; opposes the national subscriptions, i 478
Heathcote, Sir Gilbert, 1st Bart., Lord Mayor of London, ii 159; quoted, ii 322
Heathcote, Sir Gilbert, 3rd Bart., character of, ii 159; marriage to Lady Margaret Yorke, ii 159; Col. Joseph Yorke's disapproval of, ii 159; visit to Wimpole, iii 36
Heathcote, Sir John, father of Sir Gilbert Heathcote, ii 159; rides a race with H., ii 139
Heathcote, Lady, i 342
Heathcote, Lady Margaret, *see* Yorke, Lady Margaret
Heaton, John, contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 208
Heberden, Dr, attends Mrs Charles Yorke, ii 590
Heberden, W., contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 208
Heirs, protection of in the Court of Chancery, ii 495; of young adult, ii 466; post-obit bargains of expectant, ii 452
Hellen, M. de, Prussian envoy at the Hague, iii 65; correspondence, iii 134
Henley, John, "Orator," i 91
Henley, Sir Robert, Lord Chancellor and Earl of Northington, note on, ii 408; made attorney-general, ii 317; defends late government, ii 352; appointed Lord Keeper, ii 371, 408, iii 257; position of as a commoner in the H. of Lords, iii 108 *n.*; obtains peerage with support of H., iii 108; speaks in the Lords against the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 18; reversal of his decrees, ii 481, 558, iii 389; N. and H. on, iii 108; contemptuous reference to the conveyancers, H.'s rebuke of, iii 390; discontinues the late sittings in Chancery, ii 502; gratitude to H. for supporting his advancement to the peerage, subsequent ingratitude of to H. and abuse of, iii 109; and of N., iii 374; insinuations against H. as equity judge, ii 493; ill-health and probable resignation, ii 572, iii 408; insulted in Westminster Hall by the Wilkes mob, iii 460, 494; opposes Lord Royston's election to the High Stewardship of Cambridge University, iii 109; obtains pension and reversion on his retirement, ii 568 *n.*; inconsiderable character of, ii 522
Henry, Prince, younger son of James, the Old Pretender, joins expedition at Dunkirk in 1745, i 425, 489
Hensey, Dr, French spy, trial of, ii 573
Heritable jurisdictions in Scotland, i 590 sqq.; condemned by James I, i 590; untouched by Act of Union, i 590
Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 609; objections to original draft of, i 605 sqq.; compensation to the possessors, i 595 *n.*; debate in the Lords, i 613–14; Lord Glenorchy on, i 604; conversation upon between Montesquieu and Charles Yorke, ii 173
Heron, Sir Richard, i 96
Herring, Thomas, Archbishop of York and subsequently of Canterbury, account of, i 422, 102; advanced by H., ii 559; on battle of Dettingen, i 317; services and spirited conduct during the Rebellion, i 423, 461 sqq.; on factions, i 464; opposes act for restricting functions of episcopal Church in Scotland, i 598–9; declines see of Canterbury but accepts on H.'s persuasion, ii 79 sqq.; supports H. in forming new administration, 1754, ii 192, 208; insulted in his diocese on account of Jews Bill, ii 56, 132; on the bad education of George P. of Wales, ii 45; deplores conduct of the Princess of Wales, ii 307; contrasts his bachelor

loneliness with H.'s domestic happiness, ii 571; correspondence, i 189, 220, 317, 442, 449, 464, 501, 505, 514, 521, 529, ii 79 sqq., 162, 205, 307
Hertslet, engineer, betrays Tournai to the French, i 412
Hervey, Lord, character and credibility, i 159, 202; H.'s very bad opinion of, i 630; account of rejection of Quakers' Tithes Bill, i 150; Lord Privy Seal, i 193, 228 sqq.; intrigues against H. and N., i 192; supports Walpole at the Regency Board against N., i 248; behaves indecently to H., i 230; dismissed from office, i 280; ballads and pamphlets, i 280; death, Memoirs of, i 281
Hervey, Lady, on H. and Joseph Yorke, iii 135 *n.*, 292 *n.*
Hervey, Captain, appointed to the command of the "Defiance," ii 293; at defence of Minorca, ii 292, 341 *n.*
Hervey v. *Aston*, ii 430, 438, 445
Hesse-Cassel, Mary, Princess of, ii 222
Hesse-Cassel, Landgrave, William VIII of, employment of his troops and subsidy, ii 19; makes peace with France, iii 172; Pitt disapproves of grant to, iii 49; Pitt agrees to, iii 165; assured of support by Gen. Yorke, iii 129
Hesse-Cassel, Frederick William, Prince of, note on, meeting with George II, i 606
Hesse-Homburg, regiment of at Fontenoy, i 434 *n.*
Hesse-Philipsthal, Prince of, commands Hessian force in Scotland, 1746, i 502; refuses exchange of prisoners, i 516; measures concerted with, i 513 *n.*
Hessian treaty, 1755, ii 237, 259; N. explains object of, ii 240; Pitt's views on, ii 232, 243
Hessian troops, employment of, ii 19; in Scotland, i 426, 515, ii 261; with the D. of Cumberland in Hanover, iii 179 sqq.; disarming of by the French, iii 186
Hick v. *Mors*, ii 444
Highlanders, enlistment of, iii 29; desertions of, i 519; of the 43rd in England, i 460 *n.*, iii 30 *n.*; desertion of Loudoun's to the Pretender, 1745, ii 378, iii 30; good conduct at Prestonpans, i 459; H.'s opinion of, i 517, iii 29; Wolfe on, iii 30 *n.*; employed in Flanders and America, iii 29; great success of, iii 30; at Fontenoy, i 405; N.'s scheme of, ii 379; further battalions raised by Pitt, iii 30; Pitt's scheme of, ii 379; H. on, ii 378, 383; N.'s disapproval of, ii 384
Highlanders, disarming of the, urged by Sir J. Jekyll, i 590; Dr Johnson on, i 596; Lord Glenorchy on, i 605
Highland dress, *see* Kilt
Highlands, romantic scenery of the, i 541
Hill, John, i 461
Hill, Mr Serjeant, on H.'s first decree in *Gorton* v. *Hancock*, ii 480
Hill v. *Turner*, ii 469, 475
Hill v. *Smith*, ii 505 *n.*
Hind, Joseph, letter of, death of, i 50, 61
History of the Chancery, The, i 94
Hobart, Lord, dictum on the duty of Judges, ii 427
Hochkirch, Frederick defeated at, iii 137
Hodges, bookseller, obliged to call in *The Marriage Act*, ii 63 *n.*
Hodges, Sir James, Pitt's letter to (Beckford) after resigning, iii 281; opinion of, iii 337; publication of disowned by Pitt, iii 338; H. on, iii 333; negotiation with Bute on the Cider Bill, iii 456
Hogarth, William, grudge against the Court of Chancery, iii 462 *n.*; supposed caricature of H. and the Court of Chancery, ii 65 *n.*, 521; H. on, iii 462
Hohenfriedberg, battle of, i 412 *n.*, 626
Holburne, Admiral Francis, note on, mischievous conduct of, iii 215; failure at Louisburg, iii 116; on the climate of Louisburg, iii 171
Holderness, Robert D'Arcy, 4th Earl of, Secretary of State, ii 42, 100 sqq., 102 sqq.; appointment disapproved of by H. Pelham, ii 101; compels publisher to call in *The Marriage Act*, ii 63 *n.*; refuses to send his despatches in French, ii 7 *n.*; present at cabinet council on death of Henry Pelham, ii 191; exchanges Southern Province for the Northern, ii 192, 208; accompanies George II to Hanover, ii 229, 284; orders release of Hanoverian soldier, ii 278 *n.*; H. defends, ii 377; continues Secretary of State on change of government, 1756, ii 280, 337; conversation with the K. on N., ii 388; Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1757, ii 370; declines to advise the K. on the Hanoverian crisis, iii 161; hanger-on formerly of N., now of Pitt, and later of Bute, ii 370, iii 21; impertinent conduct to N., iii 55–6, 64; obligations to H. and N., iii 71, 99; astonished at George II's treatment of Pitt, iii 57; makes inclusion of Prussia in the negotiations with France a *sine qua non*, iii 145, 146; treacherous conduct in the affair of the *Inconnue's* letters, iii 23, 66 sqq., 70, 71, 72, 73, 79; never forgiven by H., iii 84 *n.*; thinks himself injured by N. and Joseph Yorke, iii 67; jealousy of Col. Joseph Yorke, iii 21, 77; objects to N.'s separate correspondence with Joseph Yorke, iii 83; endeavours to supplant Joseph Yorke, iii 85; endeavours to exclude Joseph Yorke from Prince Louis's negotiation with France, iii 24 sqq., 95; H. on malicious intrigues of, iii 70, 75; Lady Yarmouth on his malice and wickedness, iii 72; George

II's anger with, iii 72; Gen. Yorke's complaint of to Pitt, iii 102; correspondence with General Yorke on the affair, iii 70, 83; H.'s scathing letter of reproach to, iii 26, 82; project of dismissing, H. on, iii 105; strength of his position, iii 96 sqq.; support of Leicester House, iii 101, 104; Pitt refuses to concur in his dismissal, iii 104; continued hostility to Gen. Yorke, iii 99; George II's detestation of, iii 79; George II complains of, iii 42, 104; unequal to the duties of his office, iii 76–7; George II's contempt of, iii 63, 73; "Pitt's footman," iii 67; "a cipher," iii 193; "a double spy," iii 111; Pitt's opinion of, iii 99, 101; Lady Yarmouth's friendship for, iii 67; resignation of office and rewards, iii 266; correspondence, ii 34, 229, 285, 373, iii 70, 75, 82 sqq., 117 *n.*, 132, 145, 199 sqq.

Holiday v. *Pitt*, i 124

Holland, 3rd Lord, on H. Walpole's abuse of H., i 569 *n.*; hostility to Marriage Act, ii 71 *n.*

Holland, relations with Great Britain, i 251, 308, 334, 343, 359, 386, 388, 626, ii 255, 261, 287; convention of 1748, i 631; accepts neutrality from France, ii 274; attitude of, 1757, Col. J. Yorke on, iii 158; attitude, 1758, iii 135 sqq.; complaints of England, ii 32; commercial disputes with, iii 135 sqq., 231 sqq.; contraband trade with France, ii 312, 379 *n.*; H. on, iii 231; Frederick II on importance of gaining, iii 204, 213

Hollidge v. *Hungerford*, i 62

Holloway, Rev. Benjamin, note on, opposition to Jews Bill, ii 132

Holmes, Captain Charles, Anson gets promotion for, iii 215

Holstein, Adolphus Frederick of, heir-presumptive to the throne of Sweden, ii 17

Holstein, Frederick offers to guarantee to the Czar Peter, iii 298, 347

Holt, Sir John, Lord Chief Justice, dictum on Christianity as part of the law, i 81; dictum declaring slaves free on arriving in England declared by H. of no weight, ii 447, 472

Home, Henry, Lord Kames, note on, i 622; treatise upon equity, H.'s comments upon, ii 550 sqq.; H.'s letter to on the independence of courts of equity, ii 440, 443; false dictum concerning equity jurisdiction, ii 421, 444; on the duty of beneficence, H.'s criticisms of, ii 555; on the judgment in the Lords in the case of *Gordon of Park*, ii 483, 541; on restriction of entails, i 624; correspondence, i 622, ii 541 sqq., 550

Home, Solicitor-General of Scotland, ability of, i 622

Honest Jury or Caleb Triumphant, The, ballad, i 83

Honeywood, General Sir Philip, dragoons of, i 300–1; his gallantry, i 345

Honeywood, Col. Philip, wounded at Clifton, i 486

Hop, Dutch minister in London, i 427

Hop, Burghermaster, on Joseph Yorke, ii 152

Hopbinds, cutting of, made felony by statute, i 131

Hopetoun, 2nd Earl of, iii 503

Horkesley, Lord Royston's living of, held by James Yorke, ii 577

Hoskins, Mr, barrister, iii 554

Hoskyns, James, correspondence, ii 308

Hostages, Duke of Cumberland on, i 681; peers as, objected to by H., i 633, 674

Howard, Gen. Hon. Charles, note on, i 302; unsuccessful attack on the Rebels, i 542; claims for promotion, ii 169

Howe, Captain Richard, afterwards 1st Earl, note on, at expedition against St Malo and Cherbourg, iii 215; negotiations with the Duc D'Aiguillon, iii 144

Hubertsburg, Treaty of, iii 373 *n.*

Huckwell, obtains damages against the Messengers of the Secretary of State, iii 509

Huggins, John, prosecution of, i 79

Hughes, Mr, Commissioner of Portsmouth dockyard, i 226

Hughes v. *Science*, ii 470

Hughley, recaptured by Clive, ii 386

Hume, Rev. Mr, attends Lord Kilmarnock at his execution, i 575

Hume, Mr, commissary, letter of, i 337

Hume and Wife v. *Edwards and Wife*, ii 424

101 (cipher), *see* Bussy

Hunter, Mr, i 338

Hunter, Thomas Orby, Lord of the Admiralty, ii 404 *n.*; testifies to Lord Anson's merits, iii 160

Husband, penalty for poisoning, i 131

Huske, General John, note on, i 546; in pursuit of the Rebels, i 467; at Newcastle, i 458; recommends brandy, i 494; commands 2nd line at Culloden, i 523; disapproves of leniency in Scotland, i 550

Hussey, —, M.P., speaks in support of opposition on the privilege, iii 556

Hutchinson, John, note on, ii 132

Hutton, Matthew, Archbishop of York and later of Canterbury, note on, ii 83

Hyde, Lord, advice to George II, ii 322

Hylton v. *Hylton*, ii 468

I

Idiots, the Chancellor's jurisdiction over, ii 418

Idle, Lord Chief Baron, note on, ii 89; H.'s friendship for, ii 564; reprimanded by H., ii 89; on H.'s capacity for friendship,

ii 564; correspondence, i 608 *n.*, 617, 618 *n.*, ii 89 sqq.
Illegitimate children, disadvantageous situation of in a court of law, ii 466
Impeachments, King's pardon in cases of, i 66–7
Impressments, *see* Army
Inchiquin v. *French*, ii 508 *n.*
Inconnue, incident of the, misunderstood by the Prussian envoys, iii 148 *n.*
Independency, proposal to establish in Massachusetts, i 90
India, Mutiny Act extended to, ii 142; *and see* Clive, Robert, Lord
Infants, Chancellor's jurisdiction over, ii 419, 466; disability to contract debts, ii 467
Infidi perpetui hostes, maxim of, ii 128
Ingoldsby, General Richard, note on conduct at Fontenoy, i 400, 407
Ingram, Thomas, i 108
Inheritance, no natural right of, i 328–9
Injunctions, as distinguished from prohibitions, ii 419 *n.*
Innuendo, in libels, i 83, 85
Institute of the Law of Scotland in Civil Rights, inscription of to H., ii 561
Insular theory of foreign policy, H. on, iii 373
Invasion of England, Marshal Belleisle's plan of, 1756, ii 285 sqq.; Frederick of Prussia warns British Government of danger of, ii 380; French plan of, 1759, iii 138
Ireland, relations with England, i 67; common law of England extended to, iii 11; English statute law extended to, iii 11; Habeas Corpus Act, not extended to, iii 11; nature of political agitation in, ii 49–52; Protestant opposition to the government, ii 50; policy of the government, ii 50; abuse of pension list, ii 51; increase of after accession of George III, iii 378; H.'s principles of government, ii 133
Islay, Lord, *see* Argyll, Archibald Campbell, 3rd Duke of

J

Jacob, Herbert, of the Inner Temple, i 57, 106
Jacobitism in Scotland, decline of, i 601; in Wales, i 76, 77
Jamaica, right of the Crown to tax, i 89
James I, King of Great Britain, condemns heritable jurisdictions, i 590
James II, King of Great Britain (Duke of York), Lord Warden and Governor of Dover Castle, letter of concerning Simon Yorke and others, i 18, 19; appoints Anglican bishops in Scotland, i 598–9
James, the Old Pretender, letter to Duke of Argyll, i 304; treaties with Louis XV, i 547; appoints Anglican bishops in Scotland, i 599
James of the Glen, convicted of murder of Campbell of Glenure, i 557–8
Janeway, Mr, iii 35
Jeffreys, Col., evidence of against Byng, ii 271 *n.*
Jekyll, Sir Joseph, M.R., i 69; contest concerning his jurisdiction, i 94; promoter of the Gin Act, i 133; promoter of the Mortmain Act, i 148; urges suppression of heritable jurisdictions, i 590; on equity and common law as supplementary jurisdictions, ii 438; decrees reversed by H., ii 424, 445; H. adjudicates upon ambiguous will of, ii 499
Jekyll, Lady, i 69, 227 and *n.*, ii 144; death of, i 462
Jenkinson, Charles, afterwards Earl of Liverpool, note on, iii 393; correspondence, iii 284, 285, 393
"Jenkins's Ear," i 185
Jennings, Mr, of Newsalls, at militia riots, iii 32
Jenyns, Soame, at the Cambridgeshire election, ii 161; on the Pitt-Newcastle ministry, ii 371; on Pitt's resignation and motives, iii 287–8; verses to Philip Yorke, ii 147; correspondence, iii 287
Jersey, 3rd Earl of, i 171
Jervis, John, Earl of St Vincent, brought forward by Anson, iii 114
Jesus College v. *Bloom*, ii 450, 516
Jews, supposed banishment of and return to England, ii 129; status in England, ii 127; naturalisation and denization, ii 127, 130; naturalisation of in the Colonies, ii 57; right to purchase land in England, ii 127; validity of bequests in equity, ii 471; excluded from Parliament, ii 129; parliamentary vote of, ii 129; oath in Courts of Law, ii 129; exempted from Marriage Act, ii 60; the Chancellor's jurisdiction over children of, iii 418
Jews Naturalisation Bill, ii 54, 127; violent opposition to, ii 55, 76, 131 sqq.; supported by H. Fielding, ii 131; repeal of, ii 56
Jocelyn, Robert, Viscount, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, i 54; H.'s friendship with, ii 563 *n.*, 564; appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland through H.'s support, ii 536; correspondent of H. on Irish affairs, ii 51; official letter to on Lord Kildare's memorial, ii 125; correspondence, ii 133, 536
Jodrell MSS., transcripts of, ii 432 *n.*
Johnson, General, gains victory at Lake George, ii 258
Johnson, James, Bishop of Gloucester, note on, travels with N., ii 177; failure of charge of Jacobitism against, ii 47
Johnson, Dr Samuel, account of Scotland, i 602; pronounces invective against George II, i 537; criticises H.'s essay in the *Spectator*, i 55; supposed dictum on H., i 56; retails saying of H., ii 529 *n.*; on H.'s Scottish reforms, i 595 sqq.

Johnson, Sir William, Bart., note on, capture of Niagara by, iii 138
Johnston, proprietor of *Cases temp. Hardwicke*, iii 430 *n.*
Johnstone, Agneta, *see* Yorke, Hon. Agneta
Johnstone, Chevalier de, gives instance of cruelty by the Highlanders, i 532 *n.*
Johnstone, Henry, of Great Berkhampstead, father of Charles Yorke's 2nd wife, iii 445 *n.*
Jones, Alicia, i 36
Jones, Charles Valence, i 40 sqq.; unfortunate career of, i 35 and 40 sqq.
Jones, Elizabeth, i 36
Jones, John, on death of Lieut. C. Vanbrugh at Fontenoy, i 402; letter of Capt. Joseph Yorke to, i 400
Jones, Hugh Valence, i 36–7, 415; subscribes to Dover Harbour improvements, ii 564; retires from representation of Dover on being made a commissioner of revenue, ii 564; correspondence, ii 123, iii 170 sqq., 306, 396, 453, 561
Jones, Mary, *see* Yorke, Mary
Jones, Sir William, Attorney-General, note on, iii 9
Jones, William, mathematician, i 49; H. provides for, ii 561
Joseph, Archduke, proposed election as King of the Romans, ii 3 sqq.
Joynes v. *Statham*, ii 451
Judges, attendance at the H. of Lords, ii 537; H. on advantage of, iii 12; proper share in legislation, ii 262; attack upon in the Habeas Corpus Bill repelled, iii 19; inviolability of from attack, ii 522; H. on obligation of to give reasons for their judgments in public, iii 263; act making tenure of indeterminable at death of Sovereign, H.'s speech on, iii 263–4; bill increasing salaries of, iii 19, 20, 54–5; opposed by Pitt and his followers, iii 19; increased jurisdiction of Scottish, i 594; right to be heard within the bar of the House of Lords refused, i 184; complaint at receiving orders of the H. of Lords through the clerk, ii 535; H.'s reply to, ii 536 sqq.
Julian, by W. Warburton, ii 177; Montesquieu's praise of, ii 186
Junius, attacks on Lord Mansfield, ii 512
Junius Brutus, inscription of to H., ii 561
Jurisdiction, Lord C. J. Hale's treatise of, ii 551
Juries, trials without, i 100; points of law not to be determined by, i 125; rights and duties in libel cases, i 86, iii 464–5; H.'s and Pitt's opinions on, iii 501; allowed by Pratt to find a general verdict, H. on, iii 511
Juries Bill, 3 George II c. 25, i 84
Justice, administration of, chief part of government, i 594
Justices of the Peace, the Chancellor's jurisdiction over, ii 418; H.'s care in the appointment of, ii 547; powers to enforce payment of tithes, i 150; powers to compel payment of wages, i 129

K

Kames, Lord, *see* Home, Henry
Kaunitz, Anton v., note on, ii 3; vetoes cutting of the sluices at Ostend, i 434; refuses to maintain the Barrier in the Netherlands, ii 38; flattering letter to Mme de Pompadour, iii 115 *n.*
Kearsley, George, publisher of the *North Briton*, arrest of, iii 488
Keene, Sir Benjamin, ambassador at Madrid, i 217 *n.*; paramount influence of, iii 142; Wall's remonstrances to concerning British depredations, iii 142; correspondence, iii 123
Keith, Rev. Alex., marriage broker, ii 59; on sailors' marriages, ii 66 *n.*
Keith, George, 10th Earl Marischal, Prussian ambassador at Paris, ii 7, 150
Keith, Field-marshal James, note on, Gen. Yorke's account of, iii 225
Keith, Sir Robert, ambassador at St Petersburg, support of Frederick II of Prussia's interests, iii 298, 347
Kellett, Captain, commands the Blues at the militia riots in Cambridgeshire, iii 35
Kelly, George, conspirator, i 74; note on, i 441
Kennedy, French officer, i 542
Kent, Anthony Grey, 11th Earl of, i 209
Kent, Henry Grey, Duke of, and Marquis Grey, i 209; hurries on the marriage of his granddaughter and P. Yorke, i 236; death of, i 210, 238
Kent, Jemima, Duchess of, i 209
Kent, Mary, Countess of, and Baroness Lucas of Crudwell, i 209
Kent, Sophia, Duchess of, i 209
Kent, Chancellor, of U.S.A., on H.'s greatness, ii 485
Kent v. *Kent*, i 127 *n.*
Kenyon, Lord Chief Justice, refuses to admit Fleet registers as evidence, ii 58 *n.*; on H.'s greatness, ii 485; *Notes of Cases in K.B.*, ii 432 *n.*; anecdote of, ii 499
Keppel, Augustus, Viscount, note on, i 346: brought forward by Anson, iii 114; conduct at the condemnation of Byng, ii 343–4
Kerr, Lord Mark, i 459
Kerr, Lord Robert, killed at Culloden, i 524
Kesselsdorf, battle of, ii 19
Khevenhüller, Ludwig, Austrian General, note on, i 315
Kildare, Earl of, memorial of and reply to, ii 50, 125
Kilmarnock, William, 4th Earl of, note on, i 570; captured at Culloden, i 524; trial of, i 559; statement on supposed

Jacobite order to give no quarter at Culloden, i 532 *n.*; execution of, i 576
Kilt, prohibition of, i 596, 618; Lord Glenorchy on, i 605; Dr Johnson on, enforcement of the act delayed, i 597; allowed to the Highlanders enlisted for America, iii 30
King, Lord Chancellor, contest with Sir J. Jekyll, M.R., i 94; his decline, i 93; slumbers on the Bench, ii 523; reversal of his decrees, ii 481, iii 108; sum received by on his retirement, ii 568 *n.*
King, Dr William, misstatements of, ii 570 *n.*
King v. *Bray*, i 125
King v. *Burridge*, i 127 *n.*
King v. *Curll*, i 81
King v. *Earbury*, iii 463
King v. *Francis*, i 127
King v. *Gibson*, i 130
King v. *Hare*, ii 415 *n.*; H.'s argument in, i 63, ii 552
King v. *Inhabitants of Preston*, i 128
King v. *Kendall and Roe*, iii 463
King v. *Luckup*, i 126
King v. *Meggott*, i 130
King v. *Poole*, i 125
King v. *Roberts*, i 127
King v. *Sutton*, i 136
King's Power of granting Pardons in Cases of Impeachment, On the, i 66
King's Speeches, drawn by H., *see* Yorke, Philip, Earl of Hardwicke, Lord Chancellor, King's Speeches; composed by Pitt, 1757, ii 362; of 1762, iii 368; of 1763, attack upon in the *North Briton*, iii 459
King's title, right to traverse by petition to the Chancellor, ii 418
Kinnersley, Thomas, prosecution of, i 79
Kinnier, Capt., refutes story of cruelties after Culloden, i 553
Kinnoull, Thomas Hay, 8th Earl of (Lord Dupplin), note on, ii 389, iii 449; on H.'s "great figure" in H. of Lords, i 599; with H. at Cambridge, ii 139; Fox's conversation with on N., ii 389; N.'s secret meeting with Legge at his house, ii 394; at conference at Newcastle House with N. and Stone concerning Joseph Yorke, iii 103; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, resignation of, iii 432; follows the D. of Devonshire into retirement, iii 371; against N.'s plans of opposition, iii 380, 449; veneration for H. and sympathy with the difficulties of his situation, iii 512; wishes N. had followed H.'s advice, iii 512; correspondence of, i 599, iii 449, 512
Kirkeham, M.R., Edward IV's instructions to, ii 422
Kitchell, Thomas, i 34
Knatchbull, Capt., wounded at Fontenoy, i 393
Knatchbull, Sir Wyndham, vote on the Peace, iii 441
Knowler, John, Deputy Recorder of Dover, i 66
Knowles, Ad. Sir Charles, unsuccessful expedition against Spanish colonies, i 311 *n.*
Knyphausen, Prussian minister at Paris, seizure of Hanover proposed to, iii 219; sent by Frederick to England to sign the Convention with England, iii 130; Pitt talks reasonably to on peace, iii 239; conduct in affair of the *Inconnue*, iii 24 *n.*, 86; draws up paper instructing Prince Louis of Brunswick, iii 95; insists that the negotiations shall be kept secret, iii 97; sends false information to Frederick, iii 24 *n.*; Gen. Yorke on futility of, iii 244; communications of Pitt with concerning Frederick's views as to peace, iii 314; conversation with Pitt, iii 299; termination of further communications with, on account of intrigues, iii 299; correspondence, iii 147, 209 *n.*, 285
Kolin, Frederick's defeat at, ii 373, iii 115
Königsegg, Joseph, Marshal, note on, i 394, 412; at Fontenoy, i 404
Kruger v. *Wilcox*, ii 493 *n.*
Kunersdorf, defeat of Frederick at, iii 141
Kynaston v. *Mayor of Shrewsbury*, i 130

L

Ladbroke, Sir Robert, iii 456
La Galissonnière, French admiral, testimony to British conduct of the sea-fight off Minorca, ii 271 *n.*
Lagos, Boscawen's victory off, iii 138
La Guaira, unsuccessful attempt on, i 311 *n.*
Lally, Thomas, Comte de, note on, iii 233
Lamb, Mr, i 219
Lambert, Sir Daniel, conversation with Frederick, Prince of Wales, i 666
Lancaster, Chancellor of the Duchy of, jurisdiction over administration of charities, ii 418
Land, property in, power appertaining to, i 148
Landshut, Prussian defeat at, iii 153
Lane v. *Page*, ii 463
La Noy v. *Duchess of Atholl*, ii 514
Larrey, Count, Dutch envoy at Paris, confidential relations with Col. J. Yorke, ii 165, 170
Lauffeld, battle of, i 627; J. Yorke's account of, i 640 sqq.; and criticisms upon, i 644 sqq.
Lauragais, Mme de, i 356
Law, Dr, iii 485
Law, complaints of the, ii 497 sqq.; drawbacks and limitations to administration of, ii 497 sqq.; necessity of technical

terms in, ii 498, 517 *n.*; H.'s eulogy upon administration of in England, iii 263; the great bulwark of English liberty, ii 521; H. on, iii 12; Montesquieu on, iii 15; H.'s severe disapproval of reflections upon, ii 521; courts of a hallowed place, i 143; special characteristics of English, ii 486 sqq.; characteristics of Roman, ii 485 sqq., 489; developements in, ii 514 *n.*; influence of on English law, ii 485, 489; authority of in English law, H. on, ii 446, 456; statute, H.'s warnings against increase of, i 291; profession of the, *see* Bar
Law and Lawyers laid open, The, ii 504
Lawley v. *Hooper*, ii 441, 467
Lawry, Elizabeth, i 27
Lawry, Rev. John, contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 208
Layer, Christopher, prosecution of, i 74
Leach, Dryden, reputed printer of the *North Briton*, iii 509
Leach, Thomas, *Modern Reports*, ii 432
Leach v. *the King's Messengers*, iii 464
Lechmere, Sir Nicholas, Attorney-General, i 72
Lee, Sir George, note on, proposal to make Chancellor of the Exchequer, ii 229; opposed to the Hessian and Russian treaties, ii 234; hesitates to take office, ii 397
Lee, Sir Thomas, report of in Onslow's Case, iii 489
Lee, Sir William, Lord Chief Justice, note on, ii 478; sworn into office, i 161; *Omychund* v. *Barker* heard before, ii 457
Legatee to a will prohibited from being a witness, ii 53
Legacies, payment of on real and personal estate, ii 424; restrictions in, ii 447
Legal estate, equitable rules applied to by Lord Mansfield, ii 512
Legal Judicature in Chancery stated, The, i 95
Leges posteriores priores contrarias abrogant, qualification of rule, i 123
Legge, Hon. Heneage, Baron of the Exchequer, refuses to answer H.'s 3rd question to the Judges on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 49, 50
Legge, Hon. Henry, note on, i 668, ii 392; negotiation with Frederick II of Prussia, i 668; joins D. of Cumberland's faction, ii 86; appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer, ii 192; supports government in debate upon the Address, 1754, ii 219; plays a "sneaking part," ii 223; discourse with Pitt, ii 219; alliance with Fox and Pitt, ii 219, 235; inferiority in debate to Fox, ii 218; refuses to sign warrants for the Hessian subsidies, ii 196-7; acquires great popularity, ii 235; eulogised by Pitt as the "child of the Whigs," ii 197, 239, 244; Pitt's "guide, philosopher and friend," ii 239 *n.*; Pitt's real opinion of, ii 248 *n.*; visit of Pitt to, ii 232; ridicules N., ii 197 *n.*; dismissed, 1755, ii 198; on the invitation to Pitt to join the cabinet, 1756, ii 277 *n.*; urges Pitt to procure promotion of Pratt, iii 365 *n.*; Chancellor of the Exchequer, ii 280; overtures to N., ii 366, 391, 389; N.'s secret meeting with, ii 394; retains office, June, 1757, ii 370; situation of, 1758, iii 42; on H.'s conduct in the Habeas Corpus bill, iii 53; desires to drop the bill for increase of the Judges' salaries, iii 55; claims a peerage, iii 57, 63; refuses to undertake anything with Pitt out of the administration, iii 62; hankering after the Admiralty, iii 159; on Lord Anson, iii 159; Pitt's reflections upon, iii 249; penalised for refusing to resign his seat in Parliament at the bidding of Leicester House, iii 258; dismissed from office, iii 258, 266; receives intelligence from the Court of Pitt's neglect of him in the negotiation with George III, iii 471; on Charles Yorke's conduct on the privilege, iii 538; correspondence, iii 365 *n.*, 546 *n.*
Legislation, principles of, H. on, ii 57, 77, 263, iii 13
Lehwald, Marshal, note on, iii 205–6
Leicester, Thomas Coke, Earl of, challenged by George Townshend, iii 29 *n.*
Leigh, Sir John, Fleet marriage of, ii 60
Leith, shipping of, before Rebellion, i 602 sqq.
Leland, John, given financial assistance by H., ii 561
Le Marchant, Sir Denis, on H.'s greatness, ii 484
Le Neve v. *Le Neve*, ii 448
Le Neve v. *Norris*, decree of H. appealed from, ii 478
Lennox, Lady Caroline, clandestine marriage with Henry Fox, ii 71
Lestock, Admiral, failure of attack at Toulon, i 329; failure of expedition against Lorient, i 625; incapacity of, i 636
Letter, property of a, ii 464
Letter from the Hague, A, i 84
Letter to Two Great Men, A, iii 142 *n.*
Leuthen, battle of, iii 124
Leven, 5th Earl of, and Earl of Melville, supports alterations in Hereditary Jurisdictions of Scotland bill, i 607
Lex Julia et Papia Poppaea, ii 446
Libel, law of, i 82, 85, 127; duties and rights of juries in, i 86, iii 464–5; H. and Pitt on, iii 501; general verdict on left by Pratt to the jury, H.'s strong disapproval of, iii 464; privilege of parliament in cases of, H. and Pitt on, iii 501; Charles Yorke on arbitrary character of, iii 552; as a breach of the peace, iii 464; contrary judgment of Lord Chief Justice Pratt, iii 460; H.'s disapproval of, iii 466; debate on, in

the H. of Commons, iii 556; parliamentary privilege in, rejected by parliament, iii 467, 478; action of the Secretary of State, in case of treasonable and seditious, iii 464; inquiries into and determinations of Parliament in, iii 502–3
Libel Act, 32 George III, c. 60, iii 465
Liberty and law, H. on, iii 12; Montesquieu on, iii 15
Liberty of the subject, by common law and by statute, iii 11 sqq.; from arrest, limitations of, iii 2 sqq.; serious infringement of by impressments, iii 3, 4
Licences, marriage, ii 60
Liegnitz, Frederick's victory at, iii 153
Ligonier, Captain, takes orders to Lord G. Sackville at Minden to advance, iii 235
Ligonier, General John, Lord, account of battle of Dettingen, paragraph in omitted in published version, i 315; at Fontenoy, i 392: commands retreat, i 406; returns with troops from Flanders, i 449; at battle of Lauffeld, i 640 sqq.; taken prisoner, i 627, 643; sent by Louis XV to negotiate with the Duke of Cumberland, i 628; appointed Commander-in-Chief, iii 113, 125, 190 sqq.; speaks at the Cabinet meeting of Oct. 2, 1761, iii 278; supports Bute's withdrawal of the Prussian subsidy, iii 352 *n.*
Lincoln, 9th Earl of, marriage of, i 362
Lincoln, Countess of, death of, iii 111
Lincoln's Inn Hall, Chancery sittings in, i 344, ii 144
Lincoln's Inn, New Square, great fire in, ii 144, 178
Littleton, Lord Keeper, Lord Keeper and Lord Chief Justice, i 161
Lloyd, Rev. Edward, Rector of Ripple, i 38
Lloyd, Sir Richard, Solicitor-General, passed over for promotion but compensated, ii 315–7
Lloyd v. *Passingham*, ii 58 *n.*
Lobositz, battle of, ii 275, 318
Lochiel, Donald Cameron of, note on, i 437; superiority to generality of the Highland chiefs, i 576; difficulties with his men, i 519; at Culloden, i 524; subsequent movements, i 542, 544
Lochiel, Col. John Cameron of, i 437
London, City of, assessment of tithes in, ii 418; address to George II reflecting upon the Government for the loss of Minorca, ii 273; faction in supporting the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 44–6; petition against the Cider Bill, iii 384, 456
Lonsdale, Henry, 3rd Viscount, i 202
Lords, House of, Speaker of, commission under Great Seal affixed alone by the King, i 152; admittance of strangers opposed by H., i 198, iii 53; admittance of ladies into refused by H., i 188 *n.*; besieged by ladies, i 188; refusal to allow new peers to take their seats, 1712, i 60; procedure contrasted with that of the H. of C., i 201; H.'s rulings in, ii 67; unparliamentary to repeat hearsay accounts, ii 48; rule forbidding revival of same motion in same session, i 327; standing order against publication of their proceedings, ii 434; method of proceeding in interrogating at the Bar the members of Byng's court-martial, ii 344; attendance of the judges at, ii 537; H. on advantage of, iii 12; method of communicating orders of, ii 535 sqq.; claim of Scottish Judges to be heard within the House refused, i 184; hearing of appeals in, ii 501; under H., ii 481 sqq.; appeals from Scotland, ii 481 sqq.; participation of peers in hearing appeals, ii 478; duration of sessions, ii 501 *n.*; order on Lords of Session in Scotland to make a roll of the peerage, ii 535; privilege of the peerage in cases of bribery, H. on, iii 493; inquiries into libels, iii 503; right to amend money bills asserted by H., i 195, 606, iii 383; hurried transaction of business sent up late from the Commons, H.'s complaint of, iii 383
Lords, Irish House of, appellate jurisdiction of, abolished, i 67
Lorient, failure of expedition against, i 625, 636
Loudoun, John, 4th Earl of, praises Cope's dispositions at Prestonpans, i 459; surprised and defeated by the rebels, i 511, 517, 541; desertion of his Highland troops, i 517, ii 378, iii 30; captures Lord Lovat who escapes, i 573; made commander-in-chief of the American Colonies, ii 256 *n.*; failure at Louisburg, iii 116; Pitt's severe reflections upon, iii 125; H.'s criticisms of his conduct, iii 171
Louis XV, King of France, illness of, i 356; treaties with the Old Pretender, i 547; Charles Yorke at Court of, ii 170; demands settlement by England of Spanish grievances, iii 270; offended at Pitt's despatches, iii 284
Louisburg, capture of, 1745, i 433, 436; failure at, 1757, iii 116; Lord Anson on prospects at, iii 216, 218; conquest of, 1758, iii 137
Lovat, 9th Lord, settles his estates upon Simon, 11th Lord Lovat's father, i 572
Lovat, Simon, 11th Lord, account of, i 572; family of, i 573 *n.*; encourages resistance after Culloden, i 540; brought to London, i 549; impeachment of, i 559; 577; trial of, i 571 sqq., 578, 580; speech of, i 586; joke at Sir Everard Fawkener's expense, i 583; sarcastic reference to William Murray, i 57; petition of, i 578; on bill for abolishing hereditary jurisdictions in Scotland, i 606; execution, i 562 *n.*, 575, 587, 609

Lovel, Lord, opposes motion for removal of Walpole, i 252
Lowcock, Rev. J., letter of, i 267
Lowendahl, Comte de, note on, i 440
Lowther, Sir James, iii 485
Lowther Hall, rebels at, 1745, i 485
Lucas of Crudwell, Amabel Baroness, afterwards Countess de Grey, *see* Yorke, Lady Amabel
Lucas, John, Baron, i 209
Luckner, Col., captures Marshal Contade's coach at Minden, iii 234
Lumley v. *Palmer*, i 129
Lunatics, the Chancellor's jurisdiction over, ii 418
Lushington, Rev. —, army chaplain, iii 485 *n.*
Lygon, Elizabeth, *see* Yorke, Hon. Mrs Elizabeth
Lygon, Margaret, *see* Yorke, Margaret, Countess of Hardwicke
Lygon, Reginald, of Madresfield, ii 577
Lygon, William, of Madresfield, i 36, 69, ii 577
Lynar, Count, Danish minister, negotiates Convention of Closterseven, iii 186
Lynch, Arthur A., sentenced to be hanged for high treason, i 565 *n.*
Lyndhurst, Lord, on H.'s success in dealing with delays and obstructions in his Court, ii 516
Lyttelton, George, 1st Lord, note on, iii 409; divides the House on motion for removal of Walpole, i 253 and *n.*; one of Frederick P. of Wales's prospective ministers, ii 42; gives support to the Pelhams, i 391; opposed to Lord Sandwich's promotion, i 630; intermediary between Pitt and H., ii 210, 213; Pitt on his parliamentary ability, ii 215; made Cofferer of the Household, ii 212; loses favour of Leicester House on joining the government, ii 252; appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer, ii 198; censure of Pitt's conduct, ii 198; censures Pitt's ingratitude to N., ii 202 *n.*; on Byng's conduct, ii 347 *n.*; applauds N.'s conduct, ii 280 *n.*; on N.'s retention of influence after resignation in 1756, ii 361; on the weakness of Pitt's position, ii 364; on Pitt's change of front on obtaining office, ii 362, 363; on Temple's behaviour to George II, ii 365; on H.'s forming the Pitt-Newcastle administration, ii 372; left out of the Pitt-Newcastle administration, ii 410; obtains peerage through H.'s support, ii 410; complaints of N., iii 409; approves the Militia Bill, ii 262; on absurdities of Pitt's Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 4; on Pitt's "infamous practices," iii 20; on Lord Granville's conduct in supporting the Bill, iii 17 *n.*; quarrel in the H. of Lords with Lord Temple, iii 18; interview with Charles Yorke on the latter's nomination as successor to Lord Chancellor Henley, iii 408 sqq.; communication to of the conferences between H. and Lord Egremont, iii 515; his *History of Henry II*, ii 412; verses on H., ii 524, 571, iii 303; obligations to H., iii 409; note on his misfortunes and merits by the 2nd Lord H., ii 412; correspondence, ii 201 sqq., 410 sqq., 596, iii 281
Lyttelton, Col. Sir Richard, note on, ii 86; accepts office, ii 374

M

Macclesfield, Thomas, 1st Earl of, Lord Chancellor, supposed favour shown to H., i 64; prosecution and disgrace of, i 87, ii 523; H. refuses to be a manager in impeachment of, ii 381; uncontrolled temper of, i 105; last letter to H., i 88; correspondence, i 54 *n.*
MacDonald of Boisdale, advises the Young Pretender to "go home," i 447 *n.*
MacDonald of Glengary, the cause of his own ruin, i 543–4
MacDonald of Keppoch, returns home with his men, quarrel with the Camerons, i 519; killed at Culloden, i 524
MacDonalds, join the Young Pretender, i 447, 451
Macdonnell, Aeneas, of Glengary, death of, i 494
Macdowall, Andrew, inscription to H. of his *Institute of the Law of Scotland*, ii 561; correspondence, i 620
Macgregors, pursuit of the, i 539, 545; country of devastated, i 535 *n.*
Mackenzie, James, negotiations with France transacted through, iii 293
Mackintosh, Col., killed at Culloden, i 524
Mackintoshes, desert the Jacobite army, i 520; country of devastated, i 524
Maclachlan, Lauchlan, killed at Culloden, i 524
Macleod, Norman, M.P., named as a witness by Lord Lovat, i 584
Macphersons, submission of the, i 542
Maddox, Isaac, Bishop of Worcester, marriage of his daughter to James Yorke, ii 578, 597
Madras, taken by the French, i 625; recovered by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, i 633; French attack upon, 1759, defeated, iii 138
Maestricht, fall of, i 631
Maigerum, William, murderer, ii 109
Maillebois, Marshal, i 301 *n.*
Maine, Sir Henry, on the controlling strength of legal professional opinion, ii 439
Mainz, elector of, British relations with, i 386
Malicious intention, i 151
Mallet, David, note on, ii 353; assisted by H. in his *Observations on the 12th Article of War*, ii 350, 353; addresses verses to H. on death of Lady Anson, ii 581; correspondence, ii 353

Malt tax, in Scotland, i 452
Man, Isle of, constitutional status as laid down by H., ii 463
Manchester, Isabella, Duchess of, i 241 *n.*
Mandrin, Louis, note on, iii 219
Manila, conquest of, iii 368; surrendered by the Peace of Paris, iii 374
Mann, Sir Horace, advised by Walpole to form relations with Philip and Joseph Yorke, ii 572, 575
Manners, a Satire, i 190, 220, iii 503
Mansfield, William Murray, Earl of, beginning of political career and note on, i 307, 86; employed by N., in his private affairs, i 264, 364; at trial of the *Craftsman*, i 84; speech at trial of Lord Lovat, i 586; Lord Lovat's sarcastic reference to, i 57; failure of charge of Jacobitism against, ii 47–8; supports the government in the H. of Commons, ii 195; in favour of Fox, ii 198; firm attitude upon the condemnation of Byng, ii 343; commissioned to gain over Bute from opposition, ii 304; claims a peerage and the Chief Justiceship, 1756, ii 275–6, 299 sqq.; obtains his peerage, though opposed by N., ii 299 sqq., 477–8; H.'s support of, ii 299 sqq., 301; gratitude to H. for his support, ii 329; refuses the Great Seal, 1757, ii 371; advises N. against taking office, ii 387; conversation with George II on N., ii 394; endeavours to unite N. with Fox, ii 366 *n.*; dissuades the King from proceeding further with Fox's scheme of administration, ii 368, 398; called to the cabinet, iii 31; on repudiation of the Convention of Closterseven, iii 187; speaks against the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 17–18; Pitt's attack upon, iii 5, 17 *n.*, 45–6, 49; Pitt's hostility to and disparagement of, iii 57, 517, 535–7; supports H.'s memorandum to Prince Louis of Brunswick, iii 95; supports N.'s continuance in office at George III's accession, iii 307; acts with the other Whig Lords against Pitt, iii 323; speech at cabinet meeting, iii 325; opposes declaration of war against Spain, iii 279; on the Prussian subsidy, iii 344–5; supports in the cabinet Bute's withdrawal, iii 352 *n.*; advises N. to retire, iii 355; conference with Bute on N.'s resignation, iii 357; conversation with H. on the terms of peace, iii 452; declines to follow N. into opposition, iii 434, 441; reported conversation of on the several ministers, iii 400; out of the succession for the Great Seal, iii 408, 410; unpopularity in Westminster Hall, iii 410; Lord Bute on, iii 325; Wilkes convicted of libel before, iii 498 *n.*; on H.'s greatness, ii 529; eulogy of H., ii 530; indignation at attack upon H. in the *Monitor*, ii 384; Warburton's dedication to H. of the *Divine Legation* submitted to, ii 561; MS. reports of H.'s decrees burnt in Gordon Riots, ii 432; on Charles Yorke's exceptional legal knowledge and ability, ii 572; explains abandonment of Col. Cecil's prosecution, i 529 *n.*; conference with H. and the D. of Argyll on entails, i 624; H.'s great follower, ii 513; career compared with H.'s, i 56; upholds the doctrine of the restriction of the juries to a verdict of facts only, iii 465; unwarrantable attack of Pitt and Pratt on, iii 464 *n.*; attacked by Junius, ii 512; gift of oratory, ii 524; inattention to the arguments of Counsel, ii 525; on generalisation in the law, ii 492 *n.*; extensive introduction of equity into the common law by, ii 512; criticised by Sir F. Pollock, ii 512; charged with want of uniformity in his decisions, ii 512; declares slaves on arrival in England to be free, ii 474; correspondence, ii 329, 398, 550, 572, iii 45
Marchmont, 3rd Earl of, i 209; on the Duke of Cumberland, i 536; replies to H. in debate on the Cider Bill, iii 383 *n.*
Maria Theresa, Empress, outbreak of war with Frederick II of Prussia, i 202; makes Peace of Breslau, i 293; concludes Peace of Dresden with Frederick, i 626; attitude towards N.'s attempted election of the Archduke Joseph to be King of the Romans, ii 4; assurances of gratitude to Mme de Pompadour, iii 115 *n.*; improved position by her alliance with France and Russia and plans against Frederick, iii 116; *see* also Austria
Marines, reorganisation of by Anson, ii 156
Marlborough, Charles Churchill, 3rd Duke of, i 219 *n.*; opposes motion for removal of Walpole, i 252; Lord Steward, at cabinet meeting on death of Henry Pelham, ii 191; supporter of Fox, ii 188; apologises to H. for a wrong recommendation of a Justice of the Peace, ii 547; urges N. to acquiesce in the demands of the Prince of Wales concerning Lord Bute, ii 305; and the Fox-Waldegrave fiasco, ii 399; in expedition against St Malo and Cherbourg, iii 215; commands British troops reinforcing Prince Ferdinand's army, iii 216; correspondence, ii 547
Marlborough, Sarah, Duchess of, note on, i 219 *n.*; praise of H., i 136; sends good wishes to H., i 275; her causes in the Court of Chancery, i 219, 224; scruples to visit Lady H. while her cause is depending in Chancery, ii 524 *n.*; post-obit bargain of her heir-expectant, ii 452; letters to Lady Hardwicke, i 219, 224, 241
Marlborough, Duchess of, v. *the Duke*, i 219 *n.*
Marlborough, Duke of, v. *Lord Godolphin*, ii 515
Marriage, freedom of, H. on limitations of, ii 446; failure of regulation by the

ecclesiastical courts, ii 471; validity determined according to the ceremonies of the country where it is solemnized, ii 460; divergence of view in equity from that in the ecclesiastical courts, ii 471, 475; of minors, the Chancellor's jurisdiction over, by the Marriage Act, ii 418; clandestine, prohibited by the canon law and by statute, mischief of, i 123; a reproach abroad, ii 121; H. on evils of, ii 447; case of *Hill* v. *Turner*, ii 469; of wards in chancery, H. severely punishes offenders, ii 469
Marriage Act, H.'s, ii 58 sqq.; provisions of, ii 60; benefits and defects of, ii 72 sqq.; ecclesiastical jurisdiction over marriage suppressed by, ii 74; keeping of the registers and penalty for falsification, ii 66; the Chancellor's powers under, ii 418; scandals put an end to by, ii 469, 471; H. on marriage licenses, ii 134 sqq.; H. on qualification by residence, ii 134; supported unanimously by the bishops, ii 75; arguments against, ii 120; violent opposition to, ii 61 sqq., 131, 133; meaning of, ii 71; attack upon, 1764, iii 562, 564; H. of Commons report in favour of its repeal, iii 484
Marriage Act, The, a novel, ii 62, 137; appears again as *Matrimony*, ii 63
Marsh, Governor of the Bank of England, threatens to resign, H. on, iii 400
Marshalling of assets, ii 425
Martial law, *see* Army, Court Martial
Martin, Anthony, i 11
Martin, Mr, i 108
Martin, Samuel, Secretary to the Treasury, iii 304; dispenses Bute's bribes, iii 378
Martin, —, supports attack on late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 359
Martinique, Rodney on value of, iii 374; failure to take, 1759, iii 138; capture of, iii 295; surrendered at Peace of Paris, iii 374
Marwitz, Gustav v. der, note on, iii 218
Mary and William College in Virginia, H. made Chancellor of, ii 558
Maryland and Pennsylvania, disputes concerning boundaries settled by H., ii 461
Mason v. *Fawcett*, ii 428
Massachusetts, proposal to establish independency in, i 90; rebellious attitude of, i 89
Masters in chancery, sale of office, i 87
Master of the Rolls, status and jurisdiction of, i 94
Masterman, Mr, of the Crown Office, i 529
Mathews, Ad. Thomas, note on, i 397; failure of attack at Toulon, i 329
Matignon, Marquis de, note on, communications with Bolingbroke, i 378
Matrimony or *The Marriage Act*, ii 63
Mauduit, Israel, author of *Considerations on the Present German War*, iii 290
Maurepas, Comte de, note on, ii 166
Maxen, defeat and capitulation of Gen. Finck at, iii 142
May, George, murderer, ii 109
Mayfair Chapel, clandestine marriages at, ii 59
Maynard, Sir John, note on, iii 9
Mead, Dr Richard, note on, ii 566–7; i 412, ii 160
Mead v. *Orrery*, ii 493 *n.*
Melbourne, Lord, on H.'s satisfactory despatch of Chancery business, ii 506
Mellor, Anne, *see* Yorke, Anne
Mellor, John, the elder, i 25
Mellor, John, of Erthig, account of, i 25, 26; sale of his mastership, i 88; correspondence, i 39, 76
Mercer v. *Roberts*, i 131
Mezières, Mme de, i 368
Michel, Prussian envoy in London, iii 180; on the incident of the *Inconnue*, iii 24 *n.*; sends false information to Frederick, iii 24 *n.*; Gen. Yorke on futility of, iii 244; correspondence, iii 130
Michell, Richard, J.P. and a barrister, contriver of clandestine marriage, punishment of by H., ii 470; petition of his son to H., release and thanks of, ii 539; correspondence, ii 539
Middlesex Registry Act, overruled by H., ii 448
Middleton, Capt., i 256
Middleton, Lord, iii 491
Middleton v. *Croft*, i 121
Military experts, H.'s opinion of, i 199
Militia, raising of, 1744, i 327; inadequate as defence, ii 54; Pitt determined to support, 1756, ii 278; abatement of Pitt's enthusiasm for, ii 362, iii 309; H. acquiesces in, iii 110, 112; in Scotland, H.'s disapproval of, iii 29, 30; H. on, iii 109
Militia Bill of 1755, provisions of, ii 261; of 1756, impracticability of, H.'s speech against, ii 262; rejected, ii 265; measures of 1757, 1758 and 1759, ii 266, iii 53, 56; defects, unpopularity and failure of, iii 28; consequent riots, ii 266, iii 32 sqq., 34, 37; H.'s advice to the ministers thereon, iii 33, 37; Pitt amenable on the subject of, iii 261
Mill, James, platitudes on precedents, ii 498 *n.*; on the arrogance of lawyers, ii 523
Minden, victory of, iii 139; H. on, iii 233; George II on, iii 234
Minet, Isaac, opinion of H., i 51
Minet, family, friendship with H., ii 563
"Ministry of 40 hours," i 426; signification of its failure, i 429
Minorca, administration of defended by H., i 205; attack of French upon, 1756, ii 286 sqq.; sequence of events, ii 269 sqq., 303, 305; surrender of, ii 272; proportion of the two fleets, ii 270; importance of the reverse, ii 272 sqq.;

responsibility of the government, ii 267; Col. J. Yorke's criticisms, ii 289 sqq.; House of Commons Inquiry, ii 349 sqq., 358; Fox's proposal to exchange Gibraltar for, ii 305; Pitt's similar project, H.'s doubts of its wisdom, iii 123; ceded to Spain by Family Compact, iii 274; returned to England at Peace of Paris, iii 374
Mirabelle de Gordon, French engineer in the Rebellion, i 539
Mirepoix, French ambassador in England, ii 115
Mir Jafir, Clive's treaty with, iii 169
Miscellaneous State Papers, ii 144–6
Miscellaneous Thoughts on the present Posture, i 280
Mist, Nathaniel, note on and case of, iii 502
Mist's Journal, i 82
Mitchell, Andrew, British minister at Berlin, urges sending of reinforcements to the continent, iii 198; criticises Pitt's military plans, iii 127; Frederick expresses his desire to procure a peace to, iii 146; Pitt's anger with and attack upon, iii 197–8; insists upon his recall, iii 127; jealousy of Gen. Yorke and ill-humour, iii 132, 208; Frederick supports, and opposes his recall, iii 130 sqq., 199, 203, 209; General Yorke on, iii 199; Gen. Yorke endeavours to prevent his recall, iii 132; Gen. Yorke's generous and considerate conduct to, iii 132; meets Gen. Yorke, iii 208; renewal of his embassy, iii 133; correspondence, iii 116 *n.*, 117 *n.*, 125, 131 sq., 148 *n.*, 175, 179, 302, 347
Moderator between an Infidel and an Apostate, A, i 80
Mogg v. *Hodges*, ii 443, 508 *n.*
Molcke, Austrian General, i 403, 408
Moneylenders Act, 1900, ii 455
Monitor, The, attack upon H., ii 380 sqq., inspired by Fox, ii 382
Monkton, Colonel, captures Fort of Beauséjour, ii 284 *n.*
Monro, Sir Henry, Bart., i 606
Monson, 1st Lord, i 503
Montagu, 2nd Duke of, opposes Convention of Hanau, i 323; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 333
Montagu, Mrs Elizabeth, on Byng's fate, ii 345; on attack upon H. in *The Monitor*, ii 381 *n.*; account of debate in the Lords on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 18; on George II, iii 156; on H. in retirement, ii 557; on Lord Chesterfield's "character" of H., ii 569
Montagu House, purchase of, for the British Museum, ii 558
Montcalm, Louis, Marquis de, captures Fort Oswego, ii 273; Fort William Henry capitulates to, iii 116
Montesquieu, Charles, Baron de, note of Charles Yorke on, ii 186; friendship with Charles Yorke, ii 143, 186; advises Charles Yorke not to shrink from active public life, ii 140; on the superiority of men of action to the philosophers, ii 177; conversation with Charles Yorke on the Heritable Jurisdictions Bill, ii 173; eulogy of H. as Chancellor, ii 481; on law and liberty, iii 15; correspondence, ii 177, 186
Montfort, Lord, note on, suicide of, ii 224, 226
Montreal, victory of Amherst at, iii 152; Amherst on, iii 247
Moor Park, purchased by Lord Anson, ii 158
Moral and Religious aphorisms of Benjamin Whichcote, ii 562
Moravian church in America, H. contributes to, ii 568
Mordaunt, Brigadier-General, John, conducts British garrison from Ostend, i 440; devastates Lord Lovat's country, i 525
More, Sir Thomas, injunctions against the Common Law Courts, ii 436
Moreton, Colonel, killed in West Indian expedition, i 257
Moreton, Dr, iii 40
Morland, Samuel, i 49, 52; correspondence, i 50
Mortgages, equity rules well defined in cases of redemption of, ii 441, 443, 554
Mortmain Act (De Donis Religiosis), i 148
Mortmain Act of 1736, i 138, 148; interpretation by H. of, ii 443; overridden by equity, ii 435
Morton, James, 14th Earl of, speaks and votes against Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 613–14; George II's character of, ii 304
Motte, Mons. la, defeat of, ii 285
Mount Edgcumbe, George, 1st Earl of (Captain Edgcumbe), at defence of Minorca, ii 287–8, 291, 357–8
Mountrath, Countess of, ii 84
Münchausen, Gerlach Adolf, Baron v., Hanoverian minister, note on, iii 160, ii 35, 284
Münchausen, Philip Adolf v., Hanoverian minister, ii 251; in favour of the Hanover Neutrality, iii 166, 173; ordered by George II to answer the D. of Cumberland's defence, iii 188
Munroes, join Sir John Cope in 1745, i 449
"Munter, the widow," ii 183 *n.*; marriage of, ii 154
Murphy, Arthur, note on, ii 373; writer of *The Test*, ii 375 *n.*
Murray, Alexander, Pratt urges the right of the jury to give general verdict in case of, iii 464 *n.*
Murray, James, 8th Earl of, votes against the Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 613
Murray, General, defeated by the French in Canada, iii 152
Murray, Lord George, note on, i 449;

obligations to George II, i 455; commands rearguard at Clifton, i 485; declares retreat from Derby necessary, i 425 *n.*; moves to the East of Scotland, i 496; fails to surprise royal army before Culloden, i 522; supposed order at Culloden to give no quarter, i 531
Murray, John, of Broughton, movements after Culloden, i 542; capture of, i 547; turns King's evidence, i 573; evidence against Lord Lovat, i 581 sqq.
Murray, Hon William, *see* Mansfield, Earl of
Mutiny Act, 1749, ii 54; debates on, ii 84; Duke of Cumberland and, ii 167; extended to India, ii 142
Myddleton, Robert, of Chirk Castle, i 76

N

Nairn, Lord, takes part in the Rebellion, i 497
Namur, captured by the French, i 625
Nassau, Count Maurice of, commands the Dutch troops in Flanders, i 330, 343; disputes with allied generals, i 361; opposes Lord Stair's project of marching to Paris, i 354
National debt, 1748, ii 1; H. Pelham and reduction of, ii 14, 18, 53; opposition to lowering of the interest, ii 76; increase of, 1761, iii 289
National debt, Irish, constitutional dispute concerning appropriation of surplus, ii 50
National expenditure, 1761, iii 289
Navy, temporary reduction of by H. Pelham, ii 2; numbers restored, ii 42; Act making new Articles of War, 1749, ii 84 sqq.; strength of, 1756, ii 274; Lord Anson on state of, 1758, iii 217; strength of, 1759–60, iii 137, 141, 152; Aug. 1761, iii 272; estimate of expenditure upon, 1761, iii 249
Necessaries, of infants, ii 467
Neiss, Frederick raises siege of, iii 137
Newcastle, Thomas Pelham-Holles, Duke of, beginning of friendship with H., i 67; relations with H., i 288 sqq. passim; appeals to H. for support, i 303 sqq. passim; gratitude to H., i 218 sqq. passim; dependence on H., i 216 sqq. passim; becomes Secretary of State, i 96; and dispute between the King and the Prince of Wales, i 162; supports the claim of the Scottish judges to be heard within the House of Lords, i 184; his "forward" foreign policy, i 187; supports measure for manning fleet, i 191; projects and expeditions hampered by Sir R. Walpole, i 191; accused falsely of intrigues against Walpole, i 191; complaints of Walpole, i 231; on Hanover influence, i 261, 265, 269; dispute with Walpole on, i 259; censure of Hanover Neutrality of 1741, i 273; differences and disputes with Walpole, i 193, 248; scene with Walpole, i 251; opposes Lord Hervey's appointment to Privy Seal, i 193, 228 sqq.; overruled by Walpole, i 238; successful speech in defence of Walpole, i 202; considerations upon the state of affairs, 1741, i 274; retains office on fall of Walpole, i 279; opposes Lord Stair's project of march upon Paris, i 319; speech in the Cabinet against Convention of Hanau, i 324; recapitulation of events, Oct. 1743, i 318; competition for power with Granville, i 344; opposes Granville's Hanoverian policy, i 345; situation of, 1744, i 359; establishment of power, i 379; obtains accession of Holland to Quadruple Alliance, i 386; memorandum of scene in the Closet, April 1745, i 385; resigns and returns to office, i 499; on Lord Lovat's petition, i 578–9; procures appointment of Lord Chesterfield to be Secretary, i 637; without consent of the other ministers, i 630; transferred to the N. province, i 638; supports Mutiny Bill, ii 86; opposes D'Argenson's proposals for peace, i 627, 636; accompanies George II to Hanover, 1748, i 632, 655; and the Osnaburg negotiation, i 658; urges importance of treaty with Prussia, i 634; conduct of negotiations at Aix-la-Chapelle, i 658–85; attitude towards the peace, i 628, 630; opposes peace without evacuation by the French of the Netherlands, i 668; private correspondence with Lord Sandwich, i 630, 631; dispute with Lord Sandwich, i 633, 660 sqq.; consequent coldness of the D. of Cumberland towards, i 660, 662; complains of his friends in England, i 667 sqq.; H. remonstrates with, i 669; foreign policy of, ii 9 sqq., 22 sqq.; how far justified, ii 2; opposed by H. Pelham, ii 26; at Hanover, 1750, ii 24 sqq.; his "active spirit," Lord Stanhope his model, ii 12; election of the King of the Romans, ii 3 sqq.; urges on H. Pelham vigorous measures in America, ii 8; opposes H. Pelham's diminution of naval forces, ii 2; dissuades H. Pelham from taxing America, ii 8; returns to England, ii 108; jealousy of and resentment against H. Pelham, i 362, 341; differences and quarrels with H. Pelham, i 629, 634, 661 sqq., ii 10 sqq., 39, 40, 93 sqq.; causes of, ii 117; proposes to retire to Presidency of the Council, H.'s advice against, ii 94 sqq.; coldness of George II to, ii 97 sqq.; private foreign correspondence of, i 638; jealousies occasioned by, iii 22; complained of by Sandwich and Chesterfield, i 631; Duke of Bedford's complaints of, ii 113, 116; Bedford's reflection upon his treachery and subsequent retractation of, ii 40, 41 *n.*; insists upon the D. of Bedford's retirement,

ii 93 sqq.; opposed by H. Pelham and H., ii 39 sqq.; his choice of "little people" for the administration opposed by H. and H. Pelham, ii 40, 42; desires to reintroduce Lords Granville and Holderness into the Cabinet, ii 100 sqq.; George II's displeasure with, ii 112 sqq., 115 sqq.; H.'s concern for, i 631; weathers the storm with H.'s help, addresses letter of justification to the K., ii 41, 115; support of H. Pelham's financial reforms, ii 14; with the K. in Hanover, 1752, ii 118 sqq.; visit to Joseph Yorke at the Hague, ii 176; made 1st Lord of the Treasury on H. Pelham's death with H.'s support, ii 191, 207, 209; attitude of Pitt towards, ii 201 sqq.; Pitt's tribute to his sincerity and goodwill, ii 194; Pitt's displeasure with, ii 217; policy of leading the H. of Commons through a subordinate, ii 194–5, 213 *n.*, 217, 235; impracticability of, ii 220 *n.*; H. on, ii 245, iii 38, 423; denounced by Pitt, ii 197, 238 sqq.; censured by Fox, ii 319, 326; abandonment of, iii 1; ridiculed by Legge, ii 197 *n.*; out of favour with George II, ii 223 sqq.; military policy of, 1754, ii 255, 257; hampered in, ii 257 sqq.; opposed to precipitating the war and extending it in Europe, ii 282; opposes declaration of war with France, ii 258; complains of publicity given to American expedition, ii 282; repudiates "continental measures," ii 234 *n.*; scheme of enlisting Highlanders rejected, ii 379; on position of factions, 1755, ii 242; efforts to remove the K.'s hostility to Pitt, ii 236; with H. urges George II to take in Pitt, ii 196, 229, 238; declares impracticability of proposing Pitt for Secretary, ii 249, 251; reopens negotiations with Pitt, ii 196; no "glee" at coming interview with Pitt, ii 234; conference with Pitt, ii 197, 237; Pitt's complaints of and hostility to, ii 228–9, 230, 235; inclines to Fox rather than Pitt, ii 198, 250; Princess of Wales's anger with on account of Fox's being made Secretary, ii 249; lukewarm in pressing Pitt's claims to office through jealousy of his power, ii 213 *n.*; military plans of, 1756, ii 274; responsibility for the loss of Minorca, ii 267 sqq., 331, 350 sqq.; made responsible by Pitt, ii 289, 290; justifies himself, ii 306, 327, 351, 353; absence of control in military matters, ii 306, 310, 327, iii 334; campaign of calumny and abuse against, ii 273; strength of his position, ii 273; imprudence in estranging Fox, ii 304 *n.*; Fox refuses to defend, ii 275, 290; Fox's complaints of, ii 382 *n.*; hostility of Leicester House to, ii 297; George II's regard for, ii 323; mistakes of his administration, ii 195; error in not securing Pitt, ii 193; defence of his administration, iii 334; recapitulation of conduct of Fox and Pitt, ii 337; conduct vindicated by Pitt subsequently, ii 352; policy and administration justified, ii 372; followed by Pitt on taking office, ii 360; urges the appointment of Pitt to office, ii 321; Pitt refuses to serve with, ii 276, 278; on Pitt's conduct, ii 327; Pitt's obligations to, ii 202, 214, 276; Pitt's ingratitude to censured by Lyttelton, ii 202; resignation of, ii 280, 332; urges H. not to delay his resignation, ii 335; Lord Lyttelton's testimony to his right conduct, ii 280 *n.*; retains his influence after resignation, ii 361; position in 1757 after Pitt's dismissal, ii 366; Legge's overtures to, ii 366, 389; Legge's secret meeting with, ii 394; pressure put upon to return to office, ii 388 sqq.; desired by George II to form another administration, ii 365; in conjunction with Fox, ii 384; junction with Fox prevented by H., ii 366; declines, ii 387; H. prevents from taking office alone and without Pitt, ii 367, 396 sqq.; meetings with Bute and Pitt, ii 367; George II's anger with, ii 368, 388, 394; 1st Lord of the Treasury, June 1757, ii 370; share of power in the Pitt-Newcastle ministry, iii 1; Lord Anson's complaints of his admiralty appointments, iii 31; relations with Pitt, iii 27 sqq., 31, 39 sqq.; H.'s advice to how best to act with Pitt, iii 39; testimony to Pitt's abilities, iii 338; aim of Pitt to diminish influence of, ii 578, iii 20 sqq.; endeavour of Pitt to throw unpopularity and responsibility of the war expenditure upon repelled by, iii 27; conversation with Lady Yarmouth on Pitt and the K.'s dislike of him, iii 58; complaint of ill-treatment at Leicester House, iii 193; declines to advise George II at the Hanoverian crisis, iii 161; endeavours to dissuade George II from the Hanover Neutrality, iii 172; endeavours to moderate George II's anger against the D. of Cumberland, iii 187; urges appointment of Ligonier as commander-in-chief, iii 191; in favour of Pitt's project of gaining Spain by ceding Gibraltar, iii 165; presents to Mme de Pompadour, iii 123; altercation with Pitt on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 44–5; supports Militia Bill of 1758, iii 52; urges George II to give Lord Temple the Garter, iii 23, 60 sqq., 73 sqq.; Lord Temple's threats to, iii 57; separate correspondence with Joseph Yorke, iii 21 sqq., 76 sqq., 216; Pitt acquiesces in, iii 104; Lord Holderness's jealousy of Gen. Yorke, iii 67 sqq., 83; conduct in the affair of the *Inconnue's* letters, iii 24, 66 sqq.; Lord Holderness's obligations to and intrigues against,

iii 99; alarm at Pitt's indignation in the affair of the *Inconnue*, iii 67; conversation with Pitt, iii 78; abstains from defending Joseph Yorke, iii 24 sqq., 69 sqq.; H.'s objections to his conduct, iii 25 sqq., 71; H.'s advice to, iii 76; H. threatens to retire from public business unless satisfied, iii 87; compelled by H. to undertake defence of Joseph Yorke, iii 26; Joseph Yorke on his want of courage and sagacity, iii 86; "afraid of his own shadow," iii 105; justification of his conduct to General Yorke, H.'s comment upon, iii 97 sqq.; Gen. Yorke's reception of, iii 102; dissatisfied with Gen. Yorke's reception of his explanations, iii 104; assures Joseph Yorke of his support, iii 84 sqq.; memorandum for the K. on H. and Joseph Yorke, iii 83; supports H.'s memorandum for the Cabinet rehabilitating Gen. Yorke, iii 94; memorandum of conference on H.'s continued uneasiness regarding Joseph Yorke, iii 103; Bute's conversation about Pitt reported to, iii 54; conversation with George II on Pitt, iii 72; refuses George II's demand for money, iii 40; refuses *dédommagements* for Hanover, iii 91; able management of the national finances, iii 114, 125; Lord Holderness's impertinent conduct to, iii 55–6, 64; opposes Pitt's policy of separate expeditions, iii 117, 214, 252; on Pitt's scheme of excluding France from the Newfoundland Fisheries, iii 314; in favour of the separate negotiation between France and England, iii 147; anxiety arising from Pitt's reluctance to peace, iii 150; distrust of Pitt's conduct of the negotiations, iii 289; urges on Pitt wisdom of making a peace, iii 244; supports policy of conciliation towards Holland, iii 136; harmonious relations with Pitt, 1760, iii 153, 251; owing to H., iii 111; situation of at death of George II, iii 304; first interview with George III, iii 304; assurances of support from George III and Lord Bute, iii 262, 304, 306–7; pressed to remain in office, iii 261, 306–7; choice of the next parliament promised to, iii 262; advised by H. to retire, iii 305, 307, 311; contrary advice from other quarters, iii 261; urged by the Whig leaders to retain office, iii 307; declared indispensable by Pitt, iii 308; retains office, iii 261, 309; H. endeavours to establish power of, iii 309; divided from Pitt by suspicions and differences on war and peace, iii 265 sqq.; complains of being a cipher, iii 264; "not even my Lord Wilmington," iii 310; Lord Bute's plans for getting rid of Pitt and, iii 259; played off by Bute against Pitt, iii 260 sqq.; intrigue to make Bute Secretary of State, iii 265; proposes Bute's appointment as Secretary of State to George III, iii 266; alliance with Bute against Pitt, H.'s warning thereon, iii 266; opposes Pitt's expedition to Belleisle, iii 267, 311; on Pitt's despatch of July 24, 1761, iii 318; resignation of, 1761, opposed by H., iii 319; account of speeches at Cabinet meetings, iii 278, 279, 325–6; on the war with Spain, iii 340 sqq.; memorandum of H.'s and his own opinions on instructions to be sent to Lord Bristol, iii 276–7; objects to Lord Egremont's despatch to Spain, iii 294, 335; reproached by Bute for his pacific disposition, iii 337; conversation with Lord Bute, iii 333; Lord Bute's complaints of, iii 331; kept on on sufferance by Lord Bute, iii 291; attacked in Lord Bute's press, iii 292; deprived of all power, iii 293; advised by Charles Yorke to resign, iii 335; doubts wisdom of continuing the Prussian subsidy but kept firm by H., iii 298, 300, 343–4; opposes in the Council Bute's withdrawal of the Prussian subsidy, iii 302, 352 *n.*; remonstrates with George III and Bute against the withdrawal, iii 301, 339, 341–2; gives Bute assurances of finding the money for the German war, iii 343; war policy of, iii 357; on Bute's desire to withdraw from Germany, iii 333–4; "uncomfortable conversation" with George Grenville, iii 336; opposed in the Treasury by Bute and Grenville, iii 352 sqq., 356; Bute on, iii 405; interview with George III on supply for the war, iii 353; interviews with Bute and George III, iii 356; resignation of, Bute acquiesces readily in, iii 357; Duke of Cumberland on moderation and dignity of conduct of, iii 302; refuses all gifts from the Crown, iii 302; recapitulation of events, iii 355; on conduct of his supporters in case of his resignation, iii 354; unwillingness of his adherents to follow him into opposition, iii 434; on the Peace of Paris, iii 419, 437; conversation with the D. of Bedford, iii 406; George III's and Bute's overtures to, iii 404, 406; offered office again, iii 369, 423, 424, 429; Lord Mansfield on, iii 401; George III discusses the terms of peace with, iii 370, 413; induces H. to oppose the Peace, iii 372, 449; abused by Lord Chancellor Henley, iii 374; refuses with H. to convey address of congratulation of Cambridge University on the Peace to the King, iii 384; renewed alliance and friendship with the D. of Cumberland and Princess Amelia, iii 372; H.'s disapproval of, iii 362, 390, 401, 433; influence of the Duke of Cumberland over, iii 363 *n.*; conversation with the D. of Cumberland, iii 418, 423; visit to Wimpole, iii 415, 417; on expulsion of the

D. of Devonshire from office, iii 428; George III proscribes, iii 429; proscription by Bute and Fox of his followers, iii 377, 378*n.*, 440 sqq.; H.'s advice thereupon, iii 448, 450 sqq.; unhappy situation of, iii 439 sqq.; deprived of all his Lord Lieutenancies, iii 377, 447, 451; refuses to acquiesce in policy of inaction, iii 380, 420 sqq.; gives encouragement to Wilkes, iii 379; sends letter of reproach to H., iii 376; H.'s reply to, iii 439 sqq.; Duke of Devonshire on, iii 449; Lord Kinnoull on, iii 449; complains of H. to the Duke of Devonshire, iii 532; subsequent conference with H., kindness and affection of H., iii 445; urges organisation of the Whigs for opposition, iii 438 sqq.; advised by H. and the Whig leaders to abstain from organised opposition, iii 379, 415, 425, 427, 432 sqq., 448, 449; impracticable scheme of opposition, H. on, iii 376 sqq., 420; Lord Kinnoull's regrets that H.'s advice was not followed by, iii 512; difficulties urged by Charles Yorke to proposed plans of, iii 411; relations with H.'s sons, iii 367; dissatisfaction with H.'s sons, Duke of Devonshire on, iii 454–5; vexation at Sir Joseph Yorke's unwillingness to join the opposition, iii 529 *n.*; demands to know Charles Yorke's intentions, iii 426; presses Charles Yorke's resignation, iii 474; Charles Yorke's complaints of, iii 539, 541; conversation with Charles Yorke on the latter's resignation, iii 539; on greatness of Charles Yorke's sacrifice, iii 544; promises support to Charles Yorke on his resignation, iii 540; declares to Pitt his support of Charles Yorke for the Great Seal, iii 518, 542; conversation with H. on Charles Yorke's situation, iii 521; conversation with Charles Yorke on Pitt's change of attitude, iii 519 sqq.; regrets Charles Yorke's backwardness in making accommodation with Pratt, iii 542; conferences with Pitt on the subject of Charles Yorke and Pratt, iii 516; at dinner of the Whig leaders at the Duke of Devonshire's, iii 381, 455; conversation with Lord Temple on Pitt's intentions, iii 456; a court place offered by George III to, iii 468, 513; proposals to for his return to office, iii 469; conversations with Pitt, iii 530, 533; with Pitt and the D. of Cumberland, iii 531; in favour of Wilkes's privilege, iii 552; votes in favour of the privilege but refuses to sign the protest, iii 478; long and uninterrupted friendship with H., iii 560; character and talents, i 284, ii 219, 335 *n.*; capacity for business, iii 77; Pitt's opinion of as minister, ii 187; George III's testimony to his incorruptibility, iii 316; peculiarities of, i 656, ii 118 *n.*; his "infinity of questions," ii 24; in raptures with a new friend, ii 250 *n.*; fear of damp beds, ii 175; his "firm" English taste, ii 176; his temper, i 231, 629; want of self-control, ii 110; incompatibility of, i 630, 665, 676; hasty resentments of, ii 110–1, iii 450, 540–1, 543; jealousies, i 234, 237, ii 86, 102 sqq., 168, iii 541, 543; "want of manly decision," iii 310; high spirits and good humour of, ii 177, iii 27 *n.*; sincerity of, iii 542; Lord Lyttelton's complaints of, iii 409; "sensibility and goodness of heart," iii 380, 449; grief on death of H. Pelham, ii 205, 208; generosity to his brother, i 362; cuts off entail on his estate, i 254, 264; income of, iii 302 *n.*; correspondence, i 152 sqq. passim

Newcastle, Duchess of, slavery of eating roasted mutton with, iii 367; correspondence, iii 306

Newcastle-Pitt administration, iii 113 sqq.

Newcombe, Dr, school of, i 101

Newcomen v. *Bethlem* (*Bedlam*) *Hospital*, ii 426, 438 *n.*

New Court Ballad or the State Ministers áre Come, A, i 280

Newfoundland, landing of the French in, 1762, iii 403

Newfoundland Fisheries, importance of, iii 269; and the Treaty of Utrecht, H. on, iii 452; Spanish claims to rejected by Pitt, iii 151; H. on, iii 248; Pitt's desire to exclude France from, iii 269; N. on difficulty of, iii 314, 316 sqq.; H. advises Pitt not to insist upon excluding France from, iii 269; Stanley declares impossibility of excluding France from, iii 320; Choiseul refuses to yield, iii 269; restricted right granted to France by H.'s advice, iii 271 sqq., 321; retained by France by the Peace of Paris, iii 374

New Jersey, disturbances in, ii 27; attitude of British Government, ii 28

Nicholls, John, on H.'s regard for appearances, ii 569

Nichols, John, on John Yorke's character, ii 577

Nichols, Dr, waits upon H. with Sherlock's *Sermons*, ii 559 *n.*

Nieuport, receives a French garrison, iii 116

Nightingale, Mr, besieged by the militia rioters, iii 35

Nixon, perpetrator of the outrage in Westminster Hall, i 140

Noailles, Adrien, duc de, note on, communications with Bolingbroke, i 378; as advocate of peace, i 390

Noailles, Marshal de, commands French troops at Dettingen, i 297; movements at Dettingen praised by Ligonier, i 315; sends description of battle of Fontenoy, i 409 *n.*

Non-Christian witnesses, validity of their oath, ii 457 sqq.
Nonconformists, Protestant, and the Marriage Act, ii 73; George II's reign the golden age of, ii 73
Normanton, residence of Sir Gilbert and Lady Margaret Heathcote, ii 159
Norris, Sir John, i 245; measures for manning fleet, i 191; driven back to Torbay, i 247
North, Francis, Lord (afterwards 1st Earl of Guilford), i 182
North, Frederick, Lord (afterwards 2nd Earl of Guilford), supports the Government in the debate on general warrants, iii 563
North Briton, The, attacks upon Bute in, iii 384; indecent reflexions upon Bute and the Princess of Wales in, iii 459; Pitt and Lord Temple declared to be authors of, iii 400–1; H. eulogised in, iii 462; Wilkes publishes reprints of, iii 461; No. 45, the printers and publishers of arrested, iii 459, 487; fiasco of the burning of, iii 461; H.'s opinion of, iii 459, 487, 491–2
Norton, Sir Fletcher, note on, iii 494; inconsiderable character of, ii 522; counsel for the Crown in the prosecution of Wilkes, iii 467, 509; insulted by the Wilkes mob, iii 510; moves adjournment of debate on general warrants, iii 480, 563; values resolution of H. of Commons no more than that of a drunken porter, iii 480, 564
Nottingham, Daniel, 2nd Earl of, makes treaty with the Whigs, i 60
Nottingham, Heneage, Lord Chancellor, 1st Earl of, decrees according to his own conscience, ii 421 *n.*; acknowledges the force of precedent, ii 423; H. declines to follow decision of, ii 429; treatise on Pardons in Cases of Impeachment, i 66
Nourse, bookseller, duped by Shebbeare, ii 63 *n.*
Nova Scotia, discharged soldiers settled in, ii 8, 53
Nugent, Robert, attacks the Marriage Act, ii 62; supports defence of late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 359
Nugent v. *Gifford*, ii 493 *n.*
Nuthall, Thomas, note on, iii 430; conversation with Pitt, iii 430

O

Oates v. *Chapman*, ii 505 *n.*
Oath, sanction of an, ii 457 sqq.; of non-Christian witnesses, validity of, ii 457 sqq.; in the Scottish manner, rebels captured at Carlisle allowed to take, ii 460
Obiter dicta, H. on imprudence of, ii 493
O'Brien v. *Lord Inchiquin*, ii 496
Obscenity, prosecution for, i 81, 127
Observations on the 12th Article of War, ii 350, 353 sqq.; H.'s opinion of, i i 354
Observations on the Act for Preventing Clandestine Marriages, ii 66 *n.*
Occasional Thoughts on the Present German War, iii 290
Occasional Conformity Act, ii 57 *n.*
Ogle, Sir Chaloner, i 248 and *n.*, 250; assists in W. Indian expedition, i 196
Oglethorpe, General James Edward, note on, i 465; raises independent companies at Rebellion, i 461; commands cavalry, i 480; at Lancaster, i 484; fails to engage rearguard of the enemy, i 485–6
Oliphant, Laurence, of Gask, takes part in the Rebellion, i 497
Olmütz, siege of, iii 211; Frederick compelled to raise, iii 137
Omychund v. *Barker*, ii 457
Onslow, Arthur, Speaker of the House of Commons, character in office, H. on, iii 110; opposes annulling clause of the Marriage Act, ii 64; H.'s rebuke of, ii 68, 69; on H.'s not receiving office in 1757, ii 371 *n.*; approves of the Militia Bill, ii 262; and the Habeas Corpus Act, iii 42; conduct regarding the bill for increasing the Judges' salaries, H.'s censure of, iii 55; consulted on Bute's and Fox's proscriptions, iii 446; advice sought on the prosecution of Wilkes, iii 467; opinion on Wilkes's privilege, iii 492, 536; looks to H. once more to settle administration, iii 482; on Lord Macclesfield, i 87; saying of, ii 393
Onslow, George, note on, iii 407, 491, 562; urges organisation of the Whigs for opposition, iii 438; more moderate in the Wilkes cause, iii 491; dismissal of by Bute and Fox, iii 442; correspondence, iii 554 sqq., 562 sqq.
Onslow, case of, iii 489
Oran, proposed by Pitt as a substitute for Gibraltar, iii 165
Orange, Anne, Princess of, *see* Anne, Princess Royal, Princess of Orange
Orange, William V, Prince of, note on, and character, i 656, ii 32; marries Anne, Princess Royal, i 173 *n.*; general in the allied army, i 627; made Stadtholder, i 626, 638, 652; meeting with George II, i 655
Orange, William, Prince of, son of above, influence of Joseph Yorke with, ii 575
Ordnance, estimate of expenditure upon, 1761, iii 249
Orford, 1st Earl of, *see* Walpole, Sir Robert
Ormond, James Butler, 2nd Duke of, note on, iii 183
Osborne, Admiral Henry, naval operations of, iii 126
Osborne, W. V., plaintiff in the *Osborne case*, on law as the bulwark of liberty, ii 521

Osnaburg, bishopric of, scheme of appropriating, i 632, 658, 662, ii 5
Ossorio, Chevalier G. d', i 359
Ossulston, Lord, offender in clandestine marriage of ward in chancery and committed to prison, ii 470
Ossun, Marquis D', French Ambassador at Madrid, Choiseul on the Family Compact to, iii 271, 283
Ostend, captured by the French, i 388, 434 sqq., 438–441; receives French garrison, iii 116
Ostend Company, i 201
O'Sullivan, John, Jacobite, note on, i 544
Oswald, James, note on, iii 5; speech on Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 5
Oswego, Fort, captured by Montcalm, ii 273
Oxenden, Sir George, concern at having kissed his hand to H., ii 548
Oxford, 2nd Lord, opposes motion for removal of Walpole, i 253; sells Wimpole to H., i 206; correspondence, i 244

P

Packington, Sir Herbert, votes against motion for removing Walpole, i 253 and *n.*
Page, Sir Francis, vilified by R. Savage, i 128
Paget v. *Gee*, ii 437, 444
Paita, sacked by Anson, i 330
Palatine, Elector, subsidy to, ii 4; demands for subsidies, ii 26: opposed by George II, ii 35
Paley, William, on the "competition of opposite analogies," ii 495; on the necessity of uniformity in law, ii 498
Palmer, Samuel, i 51; correspondence, i 58
Pandours, *see* Croats
Papillon, David, i 51
Papillon, Mr, handsome behaviour on his threatened proscription, iii 454
Papillon, Philip, M.P., i 51, 57
Papillon, Thomas, M.P., i 17; defends the town liberties of Dover, corrupt conviction of, and escape abroad, i 29
Papillon family, friendship of with H., ii 563
Pardon, grounds for exercise of royal prerogative of, i 570
Pardons in Cases of Impeachment, i 66
Paris, Peace of, terms of and consequences of, iii 374 sqq., 402 sqq.; N. on, iii 437; H. on, iii 504; compared with the Peace of Utrecht, iii 272, 285, 289, 369, 418 sqq.; H. against opposition to, iii 512; H.'s speech in the Lords against, iii 372; attention to Frederick's interests in, iii 373; Bute's sacrifice of great opportunities in, iii 406; fall of the stocks, iii 431
Parish registers, maintenance of under the Marriage Act, ii 66 *n.*
Parisot, Pierre, note on, ii 281
Parker, Sir Thomas, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, note on, ii 478; i 54, 64, ii 460 *n.*; H.'s friendship for, ii 564; *Omychund* v. *Barker* heard before, ii 457; argument in *Ryall* v. *Rowley* referred to, ii 419; argument in *Gordon of Park*, ii 541; carries message from the Judges to H. on his resignation, ii 336; opinion in the Lords in support of Lord Chancellor Henley's decree in *Drury* v. *Drury*, iii 389
Parker, Capt., letter of, i 400
Parliament, privilege of, i 124; in Wilkes's case, iii 488 sqq.; in cases of libel, H. and Pitt on, iii 501; Charles Yorke on arbitrary character of, iii 552; debate upon in the H. of Commons, iii 556; decision of Chief Justice Pratt that libel is covered by, iii 460; H.'s disapproval of, iii 466; resolution of the H. of Commons that libel is not covered by, iii 467; H.'s approval of, iii 478
Parole evidence, cancelled by clear proof of forgery, ii 512
Parslow, Capt., i 393, 400, 409
Partridge, Mr, agent, ii, 27–8
Party government, George III's policy of destroying, ii 45, iii 256 sqq., 259, 360; H. on, i 59, iii 468, 496, 515
Patents, cancelling of, the Chancellor's jurisdiction over, ii 419
Patna, French attack upon defeated, iii 138
Patronage, Sir R. Walpole on, i 287
Peace, breach of the, i 81, 127
Pearce, Zachary, advanced by H., ii 559
Pearne v. *Lisle*, ii 472
Pearson,—, imprisonment of for clandestine marriage to ward of chancery, ii 470
Peerage, privilege of the, in case of bribery, iii 493
Peerage Bill, i 174
Peers of Ireland, appellate jurisdiction of, abolished, i 67
Peine forte et dure, instance of, i 131
Pelham, Catherine, marriage to Earl of Lincoln, i 362
Pelham, Harry, dismissal from the Customs, iii 442
Pelham, Rt. Hon. Henry, i 229 and *n.*, 176, 177, 178; character and talents, i 284, ii 78, 168; his temper, i 629; ill-humour of, ii 11 sqq.; despondency of, i 630; death of his sons, i 362 *n.*; Secretary at War, i 96; parliamentary candidate for Sussex, i 242; retains office on fall of Walpole, i 280; supported and encouraged by Walpole, i 281; influenced by Walpole, i 635; competition for power with Granville, i 344; opposes Convention of Hanau, i 324; establishment of power, 1744, i 379; 1st Lord of the Treasury and

Chancellor of the Exchequer, i 281, 325, 337; scene in the closet, i 385; resigns and returns to office, 1746, i 499; conference with the King, i 504; N.'s complaints of, i 365; disputes with N. and complaints of, i 629, 634, 661 sqq., 664 sqq., 668, ii 10, 37, 95, 101 sqq.; causes of these altercations, ii 117; rivalry with N. for power, ii 39; breach with N., ii 40; opposes N.'s foreign policy, ii 2 sqq., 10 sqq., 26; obliged to acquiesce in N.'s foreign policy, ii 35; in favour of peace, 1748, i 633; supports strongly alliance with Prussia, i 632, 634, ii 12; opposes Bavarian subsidy, ii 3; against allowing fortifications at Dunkirk, i 631; agrees to subsidy to Elector of Cologne, ii 108; supports naval expedition to Nova Scotia, ii 8; peace policy of, i 627; neglect of foreign affairs, diminishes naval forces, ii 2 sqq.; opposes Duke of Bedford's dismissal, ii 39 sqq., 101 *n.*; George II places chief confidence in, ii 116; on good terms with Princess Amelia, ii 114, 116; conversation with Princess Amelia about N., ii 114; disapproves of reintroduction of Lord Granville into the Cabinet, ii 101; beneficial character of administration of, ii 49; reforms carried through, ii 76; financial measures of, ii 1; supported by N., ii 14; reduction of national debt, ii 18, 53; George II on superiority of his finance, ii 6 *n.*; dissuaded by H. and N. from taxing America, ii 8; no influence in military matters, ii 282; answers Fox's attack on the Marriage Act, ii 65; urges H.'s acceptance of earldom, ii 77; death of, ii 78; greatness of the loss by his death, ii 78; Pitt's sense of, ii 187; correspondence, i 240, 345, 357, 660, 664–5, 668, 673, 675, 680, 682, ii 10, 12, 14, 26, 34 sqq., 37, 100, 104, 106, 123

Pelham, Tom, dismissal of, iii 442

Pelham-Holles, Thomas, Duke of Newcastle, *see* Newcastle, Duke of

Pembroke, 9th Earl of, note on, i 165, 182, 503; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 333; resigns, i 499

Pengelly, Sir Thomas, Serjeant, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, i 63; death from gaol fever, i 80

Penn v. *Lord Baltimore*, ii 461

Pennant, Thomas, account of Scotland, i 602; on Fleet marriages and H., ii 59; eulogises H.'s Scottish reforms, i 595

Pennsylvania and Maryland, decree of H. settling disputes concerning boundaries of, ii 461

Penrose, Mr, attempt to obtain H.'s services, i 109

Pepperell, General, capture of Louisburg owing to, i 436

Perkins, Hutton, H.'s secretary, i 264, 362; letter of H. Fielding to, ii 110

Perrin v. *Blake*, Lord Mansfield's judgment in criticised, ii 512

Perth, Earl and Duke of, note on, i 446; accompanies the Y. Pretender after Culloden, i 528

Perth, Duchess of, i 496

Peter III, Emperor of Russia, accession, iii 297; Frederick of Prussia offers to guarantee Holstein to, iii 298, 347; dethroned and murdered, iii 297, 406 *n.*

Petty Bag Office, the Chancellor's jurisdiction in, ii 419

Philip V, K. of Spain, death of, i 625

Philip, Don, of Spain, establishment for, i 631

"Philip Homebred," *nom de plume* of H. in the *Spectator*, i 55

Philipott, Elizabeth, *see* Gibbon, Elizabeth

Philipott, Sir John, Lord Mayor of London, saves life of Richard II, i 33

Philipott, John, the Herald, i 33; on the Gibbon arms, i 31

Philippines, conquest of the, iii 368

Phillips, Sir John, obstructive conduct in Parliament, i 464 *n.*; suit against Princess Amelia, ii 308 *n.*; George III's conversation with on the negotiation with Pitt, iii 470

Phillipps, Sir Thomas, pedigree compiled by, i 8

Philosopher, The, i 102 *n.*

Pickering, Danby, dedicates his *Statutes at Large* to Charles Yorke, ii 573

Pierce v. *Waring*, ii 468 *n.*

Piracy, act for suppressing, iii 137

Pirna, Frederick captures Saxon army at, ii 275

Pitt, Anne, on Pitt's accepting favours from the Crown, iii 281 *n.*

Pitt, Mary, on Pitt's accepting favours from the Crown, iii 281 *n.*

Pitt, William, Rt Hon., afterwards 1st Earl of Chatham, one of the prospective ministers of Frederick, Prince of Wales, ii 42; fulminates against Hanover in opposition, i 292; insulting speech on the Hanoverian troops, i 325–6; refused admittance to office by George II, 1744, i 379; opposes employment of foreign troops in England, 1745, i 478; changed attitude of, in support of administration, i 386; George II urged to make Secretary at War, i 428, iii 65; George II refuses, i 426, 503; Vice-treasurer of Ireland, i 507; made Paymaster of the Forces, i 429; supports N. in opposition to H. Pelham's diminution of naval forces, ii 2; supports Bavarian subsidy, ii 3; opposes Lord Sandwich's promotion to office, i 630; friendly letters to N. in Hanover, ii 93; recantation of his former advocacy of war with Spain, ii 8 *n.*; on loss of Henry Pelham, ii 187; attitude towards the ministers at death of H. Pelham, ii 201 sqq.; acknowledges personal obligations to N.,

ii 202; visits Lord Royston at Wrest, ii 196 *n.*, replies to H.'s overtures in "the true Chathamic style," ii 190; his two ways of obtaining power, ii 190; his "whole poor plan," ii 201 sqq., 204, 209; repudiates idea of opposition as dangerous to the Royal Family, ii 202, 204, 216; H.'s support of his claims for office, ii 198, 211; George II's hostility to, ii 206, 211, 215, 217; exclusion from the Cabinet owing to George II's hostility, ii 187 sqq.; H.'s acquiescence in and reasons, ii 192 sqq.; despairs of advancement, ii 214–5; asks H. for a patent office, ii 215; complaints of neglect, ii 212; disbelieves in the sincerity of the ministers, ii 213 *n.*; displeasure with N., ii 217; advised by H. to refrain from opposition, ii 212, 213 *n.*; subsequent attitude of, ii 219; renews his opposition, ii 194 sqq.; alliance with Fox, ii 194, 219, 222; H. on, ii 282; Fox wishes to serve with and under, ii 210; throws the game into the hands of Fox, ii 223; George II wishes to dismiss, ii 221; prevented by H., ii 230; breaks off alliance with Fox, ii 195, 201, 252; supports Legge in opposing the administration, ii 196; eulogises Legge, ii 244; attacks on Hanover, ii 198–9; unscrupulous and inconsistent conduct of, ii 198; dismissed, ii 198; evil consequences of the breach with, ii 199 sqq.; joins the Leicester House faction, ii 200; promotes hostility of George P. of Wales against the administration, ii 200; maintains good relations with H., ii 229; inclusion in the Cabinet obtained by H. and N. from George II, 1755, ii 196, 229, 238; subsequent attitude of, ii 227 sqq.; conference with Charles Yorke, ii 196, 228; conferences with H., ii 196, 197, 230, 236; offered a seat in the Cabinet, ii 233; conditions of accepting office, ii 196 sqq.; claims "office of advice" and the Secretaryship of State, ii 197, 238 sqq.; demands patronage, ii 242; opposed to Continental war and subsidiary treaties, ii 231, 243; disapproves of the Russian and Hessian treaties, ii 240; afterwards employs German subsidies, ii 259; advises the abandonment of Hanover during the war, ii 232, 234, 236–7, 240, 243; approves of maritime and American war, ii 231; denounces N.'s policy of leading the House of Commons through a subordinate, ii 238 sqq.; demands that N. shall champion his cause with the King, ii 228, 231; repudiates desire to have the Seals with the K. hostile, ii 236; changed attitude, ii 244; conference with N. ii 197, 237; hostility to N., ii 228–9, 230, 235; obligations to N., ii 202, 214; ingratitude of to N. censured by Lyttelton, ii 202 *n.*; forces the government by his conduct to let in Fox, ii 202 *n.*; inferior to Fox in power and support, ii 248; metaphor of the Rhône and the Saône, ii 195; factious conduct of in precipitating the war, ii 197, 199, 200 *n.*, 256 *n*; in favour at Leicester House, ii 252; fulminates against the Hessian and Russian treaties, ii 259; George II refuses to speak to, ii 250; excites clamour about the affair of the Hanoverian soldier, ii 278 *n.*; tirade against employment of foreign troops in England, ii 261; denounces the Convention of Westminster with Frederick of Prussia, ii 275, 291; charges against the ministers for loss of Minorca, ii 268; censure of N., ii 289, 290; speech attacking the ministers, ii 290; abuses Lord Anson, ii 273; censures Lord Anson's management of the navy, ii 333; necessity of taking in, ii 311; "the material man," ii 316; H. continues to urge taking in of, ii 310; H. on difficulties attending, ii 330; Fox opposes, ii 311; George II more inclined to Fox than, ii 333; N. urges upon George II appointment to office of, ii 321; George II on admitting, ii 321; renewal of negotiations with, ii 276; interviews and conferences with H., ii 276, 277, 328, 331; supported by Leicester House, ii 276, 333; raises his terms, ii 276; supports strongly Militia Bill, ii 261, 278; advocates the abandonment of Hanover, ii 275; rejects offer of the Seals, ii 326, 328; refuses to serve with N., ii 276, 278, 327, 331; obligations to N., ii 276; M.P. for one of N.'s boroughs, ii 202 *n.*; ingratitude to N., ii 276; resort to Lady Yarmouth, ii 277, 279, 329, 383; George II offended at, ii 332; pronounces eulogy of Lady Yarmouth in the H. of Commons, ii 277 *n.*; makes "vast professions to the K.", ii 277, 329; George II declines proposals of, ii 278, 332; Fox's desire to connect with, ii 328 *n.*, 333; excludes Fox, ii 279, 333; N.'s account of the conduct of, ii 337; "nobody else can save the country," ii 280; "visionary notions" of, ii 367, 391; Secretary of State, 1756, ii 280; Fox's censure of for taking the government, ii 360; Lord Waldegrave on his factious conduct, ii 361; support of the Country Gentlemen, ii 377; H.'s relations with, ii 373 sqq., 375; conversation with H., ii 349, 375; supports Byng's cause, ii 342, 344; motives of, ii 345; insecurity of his situation, ii 360, 364, 374 sqq.; change of front on obtaining office, ii 361 sqq.; causes of, ii 364; moderation towards the old ministers, ii 376; seeks support of the Whig Lords, ii 361; compliments Anson, ii 289; coolness in pressing the charges against the late government, ii

349; institutes no inquiry into the loss of Minorca, ii 361; does not establish militia, ii 362; change in personal demeanour to the K., ii 364; his "unembarrassed countenance," ii 190, 363; satirised in *The Test*, ii 375; adopts measures of late government, ii 362, iii 115; supports alliance with Frederick of Prussia, ii 363, 379; letter to Frederick of Prussia, ii 363; receives Frederick's thanks, ii 363; asks vote for Hanover and Prussia, ii 363, 385; promises the K. further supplies for Germany, ii 364; on conduct of the government concerning the loss of Minorca, ii 352 *n.*; supports attack on, ii 359; pronounces invectives on Anson and the late ministers, ii 351; tardy eulogy of Anson, ii 352; King's Speech written by, refused by George II, ii 373; standstill in preparations for the war, iii 116; military plans of impeded by the D. of Cumberland, ii 380; dismissed, 1757, ii 365; H. on failure of his administration, ii 393; situation of, ii 366; conference with Charles Yorke, iii 383; conditions for returning to office, ii 367; unsuccessful interviews with H., ii 367; H. considers impracticable, ii 397; negotiations with H. for settlement of Pitt-Newcastle ministry, ii 402 sqq.; makes appointment of Pratt as Attorney-General a condition to his accepting office, ii 402, 410; aim and motive of, iii 364; concurs in Anson's reinstatement, ii 404; ill-humour of, ii 407; encouraged by H., ii 409; interview of N. with, ii 367; Secretary of State for the Northern Department, ii 370, 374; great increase of power gained by, iii 1; talents of given scope, iii 114; adopts the measures of the late ministers, iii 334; unanimity of the nation in carrying on the war owing to, iii 73; gains all the credit of the successes, iii 27; despair of the situation in 1757, iii 123; declines to advise the K. on the Hanoverian crisis, iii 161 sqq.; repudiates any share in the Hanover Neutrality, iii 173; urges repudiation of the Convention of Closterseven, iii 185, 194; defends the Duke of Cumberland, iii 122 *n.*; H. on, note of Lord Royston on, iii 193, 194; offers support for Hanover, iii 162, 165; proposes grant of money to Frederick of Prussia, iii 121, 161; reflections upon Lord Loudoun, iii 125; urges appointment of Ligonier as commander-in-chief, iii 191–2; tirade against the naval and military commanders, iii 117; on failure of expedition against Rochefort, iii 187, 189; eulogy of Clive, iii 125; project of gaining Spain by ceding Gibraltar, iii 116, 165; N. in favour of, iii 165; H.'s doubts of the wisdom of, iii 123, 168; failure of, iii 123; declares the necessity of departing from the "rigidness" of former declarations, iii 166; agrees to a Hessian subsidy, H. on, iii 165, 168; speech on opening of Parliament, iii 125; complains of having no patronage, iii 40; relations with N., iii 27 sqq., 31, 39 sqq.; friendly character of, iii 153; owing to H., iii 111; policy of separate expeditions, iii 117, 126; various opinions concerning, iii 117; Frederick of Prussia's opinion of, iii 117; criticised by Andrew Mitchell, iii 127; opposed by H. and N. and the admirals, iii 117, 214, 230, 252, 267, 311; refusal to send reinforcements to Germany, iii 117, 126, 152, 198, 244; Frederick of Prussia on, iii 201; H. on, iii 245; Gen. Yorke's criticism of, iii 267; reasons of, iii 118, 130; embarrassed by his former declarations against a German war, iii 118; urged by H. to send reinforcements to Prince Ferdinand, iii 242; demand for a battle from Prince Ferdinand, H.'s criticism of, iii 247; private correspondence with Prince Ferdinand, iii 87; declares his disapproval of giving support to the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, iii 49, 51; opposes N.'s policy of conciliation towards Holland, iii 136; declaration against the alliance with Frederick, iii 148; desire to keep on good terms with Leicester House, iii 118; threatened by Lord Bute on Lord G. Sackville's account, iii 140; "unlearns his juvenile errors," and supports the German war, iii 152; declares America was conquered in Germany, iii 339; urges the generals to take risks, iii 216; attack upon Andrew Mitchell, iii 127, 197; desires to make Col. Joseph Yorke minister to Frederick, H. objects to, iii 199; Frederick declares that he will not be governed by, iii 131; jealousy of Joseph Yorke at the Hague, as a follower of N., iii 20; scheme of removing Joseph Yorke from the Hague, iii 131; George II hopes to turn out, iii 46, 48; scheme of enlisting Highlanders, ii 379, iii 30; H. on, ii 378, 383; N.'s disapproval of, ii 384; on the cause of the militia riots, iii 37; correspondence with Lord Poulett on the Militia Act, iii 37 *n.*; relations with Thomas Potter, iii 364; attempt to gain Westminster Hall, iii 20; jealousy of H. and Lord Mansfield, iii 57; hostility to and disparagement of Lord Mansfield, iii 517, 535–7; endeavours to throw a slur upon Lord Mansfield by the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 5; unwarrantable attack on Lord Mansfield on question of rights of juries in libel cases, iii 464 *n.*; arguments for the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 43; "violent rhapsody" on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 44–5; speech in H. of Commons on Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 5–6; Lord Royston on, iii 43; leads popular clamour against the law and the judges, iii 2 sqq.,

4 sqq.; reflections upon the judges, iii 19, 54; declamations and attack upon the law, iii 5; incensed by the opposition to his Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 46; altercation with N. on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 44; unworthy conduct of, iii 20; H. on, iii 47; disapproved by Leicester House, iii 43, 50, 51, 52; significance of, iii 20; pursuit of popularity, iii 1 sqq.; Lord Lyttelton on his "infamous practices," iii 20; relations with Lady Yarmouth, iii 20; conference with Lady Yarmouth on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 49; attempts to bribe the King, iii 20, 49, 50; letter of Bute condemning rejection of Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 50; "puts water into his wine," iii 52–3; opposes bill increasing salaries of the judges, iii 19; presses George II to give the Garter to Lord Temple, iii 23, 56 sqq.; resentment on George II's refusal, iii 23, 56 sqq.; anger and discontent of, iii 40; conduct in the affair of the *Inconnue's* letters, iii 24 sqq.; motive of, iii 75; Joseph Yorke on insincerity of, iii 86; indignant letters to N., and N.'s reply, iii 66 sqq.; threatens to resign, iii 69, 72; conversation with N. on Joseph Yorke's correspondence with the *Inconnue*, iii 78; ungenerous conduct to General Joseph Yorke of, iii 27, 87, 106; sudden change of attitude on Lord Temple's obtaining the Garter, iii 26, 92 sqq.; interview with H. on the affair of the *Inconnue*, iii 26, 92 sqq.; undertakes to make reparation to Gen. Yorke, iii 93; supports H.'s paper in the Cabinet, iii 95; H.'s thanks to, iii 100; aim of to diminish influence of N., and increase his own, ii 576, iii 20 sqq.; attacks the Treasury and the Commissariat, iii 316; strange eulogy pronounced by, on Alderman Beckford, iii 28; opposes increase of the sugar tax, iii 28; on superiority of an alderman to a peer, iii 18 and *n.*, 281 *n.*; George II's displeasure with, iii 57 sqq.; George II's conversation with N. on, iii 72; refuses to promise George II *dédommagements* for Hanover, iii 91; conference with H., iii 28 *n.*; speech in the H. of Commons, 1759, iii 138; despairs of taking Quebec, iii 238; on capture of Quebec, iii 240: H. on necessity of keeping in the administration, iii 60; projected expedition to Belleisle, H. and N.'s opposition to, iii 252; conference with H., iii 242; harmonious relations with N., iii 251; first interview with George III after his accession, iii 304–5; conferences and agreement with Bute at George III's accession, N.'s jealousy of, iii 305, 310; assures Bute of his support if he will take the Treasury, but advises him against it, iii 305, 431; desires N. to remain in office at George III's accession and gives assurances of support, iii 261; declares N. indispensable to the administration, iii 308; abatement in his enthusiasm for the militia, iii 309; conference with H. at George III's accession, iii 308; professions and obligations to H., 2nd Lord H. on ill treatment received from, iii 315; objects to George III's declaration to the Council, iii 262, 305; complains of having no power, iii 308, 315; Lord Bute's plans for getting rid of N. and, iii 259; Bute plays off against N., iii 260 sqq.; divided from N. by suspicions and differences on war and peace, iii 265 sqq.; Tory appointments made by Bute in concert with, iii 265; opposition to Bute's appointment as Secretary of State, iii 265; and intrigue to make Lord Bute Secretary of State, iii 265; declares to Bute his disapproval, iii 431; war policy of, iii 357–8; conduct of the negotiations, iii 281 sqq.; in 1759, iii 143 sqq.; deceptive appearances in favour of peace, iii 148 sqq., 239, 241; repudiates desire to continue the war, iii 236; determination to continue the war, iii 144, 148 sqq.; motives of, iii 149; influence on the attitude of Spain, iii 150; H. and Horace Walpole on, iii 150; refuses to negotiate with France without including Frederick, iii 146; Frederick expresses gratitude to, for refusing to be duped, iii 147 *n.*; unconciliatory attitude towards Spain, iii 143; rejects Spanish claims to the Newfoundland Fisheries, iii 151; answer to St Severino on the proposed mediation of Spain, iii 236; replies to Fuentes's memoranda of complaints approved by H., iii 151, 152; declines Charles III of Spain's mediation, iii 143; proposal of the Congress, objects in, iii 148 sqq.; answers of the Powers to, iii 114; answers to Fuentes's memorials, H.'s approval of, iii 250; does not want a peace, iii 244; determined on another campaign, iii 248; urged by H. not to reject the separate negotiation with France, iii 242; on the difficulty of making a peace, iii 149, 240; H. on, iii 245; apparent inclination for peace, iii 312 sqq.; views of regarding conditions and alternatives, iii 314; indignation at Frederick's negotiation with France, iii 244; letter of Frederick to, iii 313; communications with Knyphausen concerning Frederick's views on a peace, iii 314; distrust of his sincerity in the negotiations, iii 288–9; conduct of the negotiations, 1761, Frederick's criticism of, iii 285; conversation with Fuentes, H. on, iii 319; changed attitude of towards the negotiations, H. on, iii 315, 317; audience of George III, iii 315; N.'s conversation with George III on, iii 316; difficulties in making a peace, iii 286 sqq.; refuses to give opinion concerning terms of

peace, iii 287; motives of his opposition to peace, iii 286; supports the separate negotiation with France, iii 268; conduct of the negotiations with France, iii 268 sqq., 318 sqq.; N. on, iii 322; Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 337; despatch of June 26, 1761, importance of, iii 269, 282; insists on France giving up the Newfoundland Fisheries, iii 269; despatch of July 24, 1761, H.'s disapproval of, iii 270, 318; violence at the Cabinet meeting of Aug. 14, 1761, iii 320; speech at, iii 271; despatch of Aug. 15, 1761, supported by George III and Bute, iii 272 *n.*; H. on, iii 271 sqq.; style of his despatches, remonstrances thereon from Stanley, Louis XV offended with, Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 284, 321; Choiseul's distrust of his intentions, iii 237; speech at Cabinet of Aug. 24, iii 272–3; speech at Cabinet of Sep. 18 in support of war with Spain, iii 275; speeches at Cabinet of Sept. 21, iii 325–6; adheres to his opinions, iii 325; speech at Cabinet of Oct. 2, iii 278, 279; breaks off the negotiations with France, iii 274; on the question of war with Spain, iii 332; instructions to Lord Bristol, iii 274; demand for war against Spain, grounds of his policy, iii 275; opposition to, iii 274; rejected by the Cabinet, iii 277; memorandum to George III demanding declaration of war against Spain of Temple and, iii 275, 325; resignation of, iii 280; criticised, iii 281; contemporary opinion of, iii 287–8; Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 333; reason of, iii 58; ill effects of, iii 291; responsibility of, for breakdown of administration, iii 285; subsequent conduct of, iii 280; accepts favours from the Crown, iii 280, 330; observations of his sisters upon, iii 281 *n.*; proposed office of Governor of Canada for, iii 330; visit to H. after his resignation, iii 281, 329; good humoured conference with H., iii 332; declares his intentions, iii 332; triumphal visits to the city, iii 281; George III's resentment at, iii 496; enthusiastic meeting in the city in support of, iii 336; letter to Sir James Hodges, iii 281; H. and N. on, iii 333–4; Sir J. Yorke on, iii 337; disowns publication of, iii 338; speech on the Address, Nov. 1761, iii 338–9; on the Prussian alliance and subsidy, iii 301; suggestions from Frederick to, for support in organising opposition to Bute, rejected by, iii 299; conversation with Knyphausen, iii 299; urges moderation upon Frederick, iii 299; refuses to convey address from Bath of congratulation upon the Peace to the King and resigns his seat, iii 384; as author of the *North Briton*, iii 400–1; on the D. of Devonshire's expulsion from office, iii 430; conversation of, with Thomas Nuthall, iii 430; declaration against Bute, iii 430; conference with Thomas Townshend, iii 447; N. on intentions of, iii 423; diminished popularity of, iii 436; relations with H., iii 424; inviolable attachment to Lord Temple, iii 508; proposed negotiation of the Whig Lords with, through Charles Yorke, iii 424; offers of office to, iii 370; attacks the Cider Bill in the Commons, iii 382; sanguine of the effects of the opposition to the Cider Bill, iii 456; in favour at Court, March, 1763, iii 455; on George Grenville's unfitness for the chief power, iii 487; George III's proscription of, iii 458, 496; D. of Bedford urges George III to summon to office, iii 471; relations with Bute, iii 431, 469, 472; H. and D. of Cumberland on, iii 530, 532; rejection of proposals from Bute for his return to office, iii 468, 509; negotiations with the Duke of Bedford, iii 532; visited by Bute with offer from George III, iii 469, 523, 525; object of, iii 530; negotiation with George III, iii 523 sqq.; H. on his management of, iii 531; failure of, iii 469–70; George III makes capital of, iii 537; proposed advancement of Pratt communicated by George III to Charles Yorke, iii 470, 473, 537; refusal to admit the D. of Bedford into his administration communicated to the latter by George III, iii 471; abhorrence of the D. of Bedford, iii 530; conversations with N., iii 530, 531, 533; interview with Lord Rockingham, iii 545; conference with the D. of Cumberland, iii 546; respect and regard for H. as necessary in the administration, iii 517, 531; H. on intentions of, iii 531; despondency of, iii 533; conduct of, N.'s motion of condemnation of, iii 537, 542; supports the King's Speech, 1763, iii 477; jealousy of, regarding H.'s and Lord Egremont's conferences, iii 473, 518, 528; attitude towards opposition, iii 363, 427, 430; Lord Bute on, iii 280 *n.*; necessary to any opposition party, iii 363; H. on, iii 415; disclaims opposition, iii 530, 534, 546; H. on, iii 447–8; D. of Devonshire on, iii 454–5; conference of the D. of Devonshire with Pratt on, iii 557; cause of, iii 476; thinks he has made a good impression upon George III, D. of Cumberland assures him of the contrary, iii 547–8; repudiates party ties in his speech against the Preliminaries of Peace, iii 371; Lady Temple on, iii 375; abstains from voting against the Peace of Paris, iii 375; Lord Royston's disgust at his conduct, iii 427; Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 371; Lord Temple announces alliance of, with the Whig Lords, iii 381, 456; at dinner of the Whig leaders at the D. of Devonshire's, iii 381, 455; attitude towards Wilkes, iii 533; gives support

to Wilkes agitation, iii 363; treats affair of Wilkes slightly, iii 508, 539; H. on moderation of, iii 497, 498, 500; supports Wilkes's privilege, iii 543; H.'s opposition to, iii 501; furnished with legal arguments by Pratt, iii 460, 493 *n.*; supports leaving general verdict to the jury, H.'s disapproval of, iii 464, 501; attitude towards Charles Yorke, iii 472 sqq., 547; Charles Yorke's difference on Wilkes's privilege with Pratt and, iii 533 sqq.; friendship with Charles Yorke, ii 196, 364, 456, 550; desire for a confidential union with Charles Yorke, of Temple and, iii 498 sqq.; "hankering after" Charles Yorke, iii 499, 506; conference with Charles Yorke, June, 1763, iii 503, 506; later accounts of, by Charles Yorke and, iii 517 sqq.; friendly assurances of support to Charles Yorke, H. on, iii 472–3; declares his preference for Charles Yorke for the Great Seal with the proviso of Pratt's acquiescence, Charles Yorke's reply to, iii 498–9, 504, 507, 509; highly pleased with the "House of Yorke," iii 497, 503; sprinkles holy water, iii 503; H. on, iii 472; in collision with Charles Yorke, iii 363; further interview with Charles Yorke, Oct. 1763, iii 473; H. on, iii 533, 535, 538; increase of differences with Charles Yorke, iii 482, 497; changed attitude of, and complaints of Charles Yorke, iii 516 sqq.; cause of, iii 473; surprise and distress of Charles Yorke on, iii 519 sqq.; affects surprise at Charles Yorke's opinion upon the privilege, N.'s and the 2nd Lord H.'s comments on, iii 534, 538; H. on demands of, from Charles Yorke, iii 535, 538; Lord Rockingham on motive of hostility to Charles Yorke of, iii 545; complains of Charles Yorke's resignation, iii 476, 547; extravagant eulogy of Chief Justice Pratt, iii 517; renewed support of Pratt, iii 516 sqq.; declares his preference for Pratt to Charles Yorke, iii 537; complains of his usage from the Yorke family, iii 547; declares a breach with Charles Yorke, iii 534; conferences with N. on the subject of Charles Yorke and Pratt, iii 516; N. declares his support of Charles Yorke for the Great Seal to, iii 518, 542; N.'s extenuation of and H.'s opinion of conduct towards Charles Yorke of, iii 521–2; repudiates finally all ties with Charles Yorke and H.'s family, and goes into seclusion, iii 482; D. of Cumberland and N. on necessity of reconciliation with Charles Yorke of, iii 559; applauds Charles Yorke, iii 478; attack on Charles Yorke in the H. of Commons, Charles Yorke's indignation at, iii 477; joy at Charles Yorke's opposition to the government, iii 556; speech in the H. of Commons in reply to Charles Yorke in support of the privilege, iii 478, 556; treats Charles Yorke with marked deference, iii 479, 480, 558; abuse of the lawyers of, Lord Royston and Lord Temple on, iii 556–7; engages the Whig Lords to vote in favour of the privilege in libels, iii 478; ill but in excellent spirits at debate on general warrants, iii 564; altercations with Charles Yorke, iii 563; "in love" with Charles Yorke, iii 481, 564; approbation of Charles Yorke's conduct, iii 565; attacks the judges, iii 481; speech against general warrants, iii 481; character and talents, i 282, ii 189 sqq., 323; Lord Shelburne on, ii 277 *n.*; H. on, iii 38; Gen. Yorke on, iii 130; Lord Waldegrave on, ii 363; Frederick of Prussia's contemptuous references to, iii 117 *n.*, 131; N.'s testimony to his abilities, iii 115, 338–9; eloquence of, i 386, iii 6; conduct to George II, ii 189; George II's dislike of, ii 321, 364, iii 63; George III on tyranny of, iii 536; overbearing temper censured by Leicester House, iii 54; complaint of his *ton impératif*, iii 320; "insolence" of, iii 272, 278; George II on his ignorance of the way to treat Kings, iii 131 *n.*; provocative disposition, iii 27 *n.*; N. on uncertainty of his temper, iii 192; his vivacities, iii 31; ill-humour of, ascribed by H. to his ill-health, iii 47; "acrimony" of, H. on, iii 287; unreasonableness of, D. of Cumberland on, iii 547; Charles Townshend on, iii 546; Charles Yorke on, iii 558; N. on, iii 543; H. on, iii 536; Lord Granville on his "madness," ii 367; Lord Bute on his "meanness," ii 277; want of candour, ii 190, 201 sqq., iii 106; want of generosity, iii 27 sqq., 106, 126, 316; incapacity for friendship, iii 364, 550; disposition to be busy and important, H. on, iii 249; intrigues and ambition, ii 190; uses opposition as a means to gain office and power, ii 190; inconsistencies, ii 189; criticised, iii 290; compliments to Lord Royston, iii 312; treatment of H.'s family, iii 367; true greatness of, ii 190; marriage, ii 137; on marriage, ii 584; on military talent, iii 208; attitude towards liberty of the press, H.'s opposition to, iii 501, 516; seldom reads newspapers, iii 338; opinion of Fox and Fox's opinion of, ii 71–2 *n.*; on George II, iii 155; correspondence, ii 201 sqq., 325, 402, 406, 409, 584, iii 27, 50, 63 *n.*, 68 sqq., 94, 100, 102, 106, 123, 240, 250 sqq., 312, 315, 365, 493 *n.*, 524, 533 sqq.

Pitt, John, 2nd Earl of Chatham, birth of, ii 325

Pitt-Newcastle Administration, H.'s success in settling, ii 404; H. on necessity of, ii 410; character of, ii 372; great strength of, iii 1; advantages from, iii 113 sqq.

Place Bill, i 289
Placentia, battle of, i 515 *n.*
Plantation Act, 13 George II c. 7, ii 57
Plassey, Clive's victory at, ii 274, iii 125
Plead, refusal to, penalty for, i 131
Plumptre, Rev. Charles, rector of Wimpole, preferment given to by H., ii 563 *n.*; legacy of H. to, iii 486
Plumptre family, friendship of with H., ii 563
Plunket, John, conspirator, i 74
Pluralities, i 149
Pocock, Admiral Sir George, victory at Havannah, iii 419
Podewils, Count Henry v., Prussian foreign minister, i 262, iii 173
Poisoning a husband, penalty for, i 131
Polwarth, Viscount, i 209
Police, institution of, ii 52
Pomfret, 2nd Earl of, note on, ii 548; conduct to Lady Ranelagh, ii 548
Pompadour, Mme de, advocate of peace, 1748, i 654; "trembles" at Joseph Yorke's approach, ii 150; project of the English ministers of gaining, H. on, iii 123; N.'s presents to, iii 123; Maria Theresa's assurances of gratitude to, iii 115 *n.*
Pondicherry, failure of expedition against, i 627; conquest of, iii 152, 267
Poniatowski, Stanislas, Count, afterwards King of Poland, note on, ii 579; friendship with H.'s family, ii 579 *n.*; impressions of H. and his family, ii 579; on H., ii 584; correspondence, ii 579, 584
Ponsonby, Major-Gen. Hon. Henry, killed at Fontenoy, note on, i 393
Poole, Sir Francis, iii 440
Pope, Alexander, Bolingbroke's letters to, i 367
Pope v. *Curl*, ii 464
Porten, James, i 34
Porten, Judith, *see* Gibbon, Judith
Porteous riots, i 131, 152, 215; bill inflicting penalties for, i 183, ii 533–4
Portobello, Admiral Vernon at, i 267; conquest of, i 195
Portsmouth dockyard, i 226
Portugal, helped with troops against Spain, iii 293, 295, 368
Post-Obit securities, bargains with heirs expectant on, ii 452
Potsdam, Gen. Yorke's impressions of, iii 229
Potter, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, i 180; at the Regency Board, i 248
Potter, Thomas, character of, relations with Pitt, iii 364, 365; attacks the government at Pitt's instigation, ii 256; urges advancement of Pratt to "lower H.'s insolence," iii 365; receives office, 1757, ii 374; activity in administering the Militia Act, iii 37; on change of principles, iii 121 *n.*; quoted, ii 195 *n.*; correspondence, ii 275 *n.*, iii 365
Poulett, Lord, correspondence with Pitt on the failure of the Militia Act, iii 37 *n.*
Powis House, i 205
Powys, Sir Littleton, note on, skit on by H., i 65
Poynings' Act, iii 11
Practical Registry, stigmatised by H. as of no value, ii 430 *n.*
Prades, Abbé de, conviction of, iii 129
Praed, Mr Mackworth, i 109
Pragmatic Sanction, i 203
Prague, capture by the French, i 204; Frederick's victory at, iii 115
Pratt, Charles, afterwards Earl Camden, N. brings into Parliament, ii 309, 315, 317, iii 365; H.'s friendship for, ii 316; H.'s treatment of, iii 365–6 *n.*; Charles Yorke's friendship for, ii 317; refuses H.'s offer of 2nd Judgeship of Chester, ii 316 sqq., iii 365; aim of Pitt to increase influence of in Westminster Hall, iii 20; appointment of Attorney-General over Charles Yorke's head a condition of Pitt's accepting office, ii 372, 402, 410; Lord Bute on, the 2nd Lord H. on motive of, iii 364, 366; beginning of the rivalry of Charles Yorke with, ii 309, 311, 315 sqq.; consequences of, iii 364 sqq.; amicable relations with Charles Yorke, iii 366; Charles Yorke draws reports for, ii 572, iii 504; speech in the H. of Commons in support of the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 4, 6, 43; supports Pitt in his attack upon the judges, iii 4 sqq.; opposes the bill to increase the judges' salaries, iii 55; Pitt's extravagant eulogy of, iii 517; George II wishes to remove from office, iii 46, 48; compelled to accept Chief-Justiceship of the Common Pleas, ii 574, iii 293, 366; Walpole on the consequences of, iii 460; Pitt's declaration of his preference for Charles Yorke for the Great Seal over, with the proviso of acquiescence of, iii 472, 498–9, 504, 507, 509; application of writ of Habeas Corpus for Wilkes to, iii 460; H. on, iii 488, 492; proceedings in Wilkes's case before, iii 492; discharges Wilkes on his privilege of Parliament, iii 460; decides that libel is not a breach of the peace, iii 460; H.'s disapproval of, iii 466; judgment that libel is covered by parliamentary privilege, H.'s disapproval of, iii 466; contrary decision by the H. of Commons, iii 467; leaves general verdict to the jury in libel, H.'s strong disapproval of, iii 464, 511; declares general warrants illegal, iii 460, 511; Charles Yorke's differences on Wilkes's privilege with Pitt and, iii 533 sqq.; conduct of the trial of the Messengers of the Secretary of State, H. on, iii 510–11; on right of Secretary of State to issue warrants, iii 463; furnishes Pitt with legal arguments, iii 460, 493 *n.*; popularity of, ii 522, iii 460; conduct approved by the D. of Cumberland, iii 519; Pitt's proposal of

Charles Yorke's accommodation with, H. on meaning of, iii 535; backwardness of Charles Yorke, iii 520; N.'s regrets at, iii 542; H. slighted by and dislike of, iii 522; Pitt renews his support of claims of, iii 516 sqq.; Pitt gives preference for the Great Seal to over Charles Yorke, iii 517, 537; Pitt's advocacy of his advancement in negotiation with George III, iii 470, 473; communicated to Charles Yorke by George III, iii 537; conference with the D. of Devonshire at Bath on Pitt and Charles Yorke, iii 557; unwarrantable attack on Lord Mansfield on question of rights of juries in libel cases, iii 464 *n.*; on H.'s greatness, ii 484, 521–9; annuity of over and above his salary, ii 568 *n.*; seldom wrote his judgments, ii 515 *n.*; opinion in the Lords in support of Lord Chancellor Henley's decree in *Drury* v. *Drury*, iii 389; excessive self-confidence of, H.'s rebuke of, iii 390; inaccuracy of his anecdotes, iii 365 *n.*; correspondence, iii 366 *n.*, 493 *n.*

Pratt, Sir John, Lord Chief Justice, i 74

Precedents, value of, i 129, ii 422 sqq., 488–9

Prerogative, the K.'s, management of his family, ii 48

Presbyterians at Dover, i 20

Prescot, ex parte, ii 444

Press, the, H. and support of, ii 373 *n.*; liberty of the, i 85; H. on, i 190, 220–1, iii 466, 501; Pitt's views on, iii 466, 501, 516

Prestonpans, Jacobite victory at, i 415, 457 sqq.

Pretender, the Old, *see* James, the Old Pretender

Pretender, the Young, *see* Charles, the Young Pretender

Prideaux, campaign of in Canada, iii 138

Priest v. *Parrot*, ii 466

Prisons, condition of, i 79, 501

Privateers, British, complaints of, iii 135, 137, 142 sqq.

Privilege of parliament, of the peerage, *see* Parliament, privilege of, Peerage, privilege of

Privy Council, action in interfering in laws of Colonial parliament questioned, i 91; appeals to, ii 483 *n.*

Prize Causes, court and commissioners of, ii 420, 483 *n.*

Probyn, Sir Edmund, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, note on, ii 540

Progress of a Divine, The, i 127

Prohibitions, as distinguished from injunctions, ii 419 *n.*

Protestant Succession, importance of the, i 575

Protestants, foreign bill to naturalise, abandoned, ii 58; enlistment of in America, ii 273

Prowse, Thomas, M.P., correspondence with H., i 10

Prowse v. *Abingdon*, ii 424, 438

Prussia, Prince August Ferdinand of, iii 220, 228

Prussia, Princess August Ferdinand of, iii 220, 228

Prussia, August Wilhelm, Prince of, note on, iii 220, 229

Prussia, Prince Henry of, iii 205, 220, 227, 228; victory at Freiburg, iii 368

Prussia, Louise, Princess of, iii 220, 229

Prussia, Elizabeth, Queen of, wife of Frederick, Gen. Yorke's account of, iii 228

Prussia, relations with, convention Aug. 1745, i 412 *n.*; relations with, 1754, ii 255; *see also* Frederick II, K. of Prussia

Prynne, William, writes against admission of the Jews into England, ii 129

Public Office, bond to pay £800 out of profits of, cancelled by H., ii 474

Public order, maintenance of, ii 52

Puffendorf, on obligation of an oath, ii 459

Puisieux, Marquis de, note on, ii 165

Puisieux, Mme de, wit of, ii 165

Pullen v. *Lord Middleton*, ii 437 *n.*

Pulteney, William, Earl of Bath, *see* Bath, Earl of

Q

Quadruple Alliance, i 73, 386; denounced by Lord Bolingbroke, i 310

Quakers, exempted from Marriage Act, ii 60; exempted from oaths, ii 457; imprisoned for refusal to assess taxes in New England, i 91

Quakers' Tithes Bill, i 149

Quebec, Wolfe's despairing letter from, iii 238; conquest of, iii 138; H. on, iii 238 sqq.; Pitt on, iii 240; Charles III of Spain on, iii 143; H. on difficulty of keeping, iii 239; relieved, 1760, by the British navy, iii 152

Queen v. *Read*, i 82

Queensberry, Duchess of, heads band of ladies besieging the House of Lords, i 188

Quiberon Bay, Hawke's victory in, iii 138

Qui civitatem amisit, haeredem habere non potest, i 329

Quo Warranto, writ of, issued against the Corporations, i 28

R

Radcliffe, Hon. Charles, execution of, i 537

Ranelagh, Selina, Lady, note on, ii 549; complaints to H. of Lord Pomfret's behaviour, ii 548; correspondence, ii 548

Ravensworth, Henry, Lord, brings charge of Jacobitism against Murray and others, ii 48; attempts to postpone decision by the Lords in *Drury* v. *Drury*,

iii 389; moves in the Lords for the production of the war accounts, iii 455; "has his feelings," iii 397
Raymond, Sir Robert, Lord Chief Justice, i 79, 81; limits juries to verdict on facts, iii 465
Read, General, letter of, i 348
Real estate, payment of a legacy upon, ii 424
Reay, Lord, i 449
Rebellion, the, of 1745, i 415 sqq.
Reech v. *Kennegal*, ii 442
Reeves, Mr, barrister, i 113
Reflections touching the Law, ii 504 *n.*
Regalities in Scotland, i 590 sqq.
Regency Bill of 1751, ii 45; George II's objections to the draft, ii 112; restrictions on marriage of heir to the crown under, ii 75; followed as a precedent in 1765, ii 46
Registers, parish, keeping of under the Marriage Act, ii 61; of clandestine marriages, admission of as evidence, ii 58
Religious tolerance, H. on, i 61
Remainders, English, introduction of into Scottish law, ii 483, 544
Remembrancer, The, abusive article in against H., iii 292 *n.*
Reporters, official, legal, absence of, failure of Bacon's appointment of, ii 433; appointment of, ii 434
Report of Some Proceedings, A, correspondence of Sir Michael Foster and H. concerning, ii 433
Reports, Chancery, MS cases cited in Court, ii 430; fewness and untrustworthiness of, ii 429 sqq.; inconvenience of this neglect, ii 430
Retzow, General, Gen. Yorke's account of, note on, iii 226
Review or supplement, bills of, order of H. concerning, ii 517
Rex v. —, *see King* v. —
Reynish v. *Martin*, ii 447 *n.*
Reynolds, rioter, execution of, i 132
Rice, Mr, at the Cambridgeshire election, ii 161
Rich, Col., claims for promotion, ii 169; wounded at Culloden, i 524
Rich's dragoons, i 302
Richardson, re, ii 474
Richelieu, duc de, commands force at Dunkirk for invasion, i 425, 489; lands in Minorca, ii 268; difficulties of, ii 291, 304; letter of recommendation of Byng, ii 343, 357; hesitation in pursuing the D. of Cumberland in Hanover, ii 348 *n.*; reply to the D. of Cumberland's proposal for a suspension of arms, iii 172; signs the Convention of Closterseven, iii 177; advantage given to by the Convention, iii 120; enabled to detach reinforcements to the Prince de Soubise, iii 178; Frederick of Prussia begins a negotiation with, iii 123
Richmond, Charles, 2nd Duke of, i 165, 182: complains of the King's favour to Hanoverian troops, i 340; opposes Convention of Hanau, i 323; supports H.'s paper to the King, i 333; commands forces against rebels, i 476; appointed ambassador to France, i 664; on Lord Mansfield, i 307 *n.*
Richmond, Charles, 3rd Duke of, note on, on Lord G. Sackville's conduct at Minden, iii 235
Ridgeway, W., *Reports*, ii 431 *n.*; tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 526 *n.*
Ridgeway, John, murderer, ii 109
Rigby, Richard, note on, iii 389; justifies Fox's desertion of the ministers, ii 275 *n.*; on Lord Temple's insolence to George II, ii 365; position in George Grenville's administration, iii 498; deserts Fox, iii 389; correspondence, ii 342 *n.* sqq., 362, 408 *n.*, 575
Rigden v. *Vallier*, ii 480
Riots, instructions to troops in quelling, i 93
Ripon, Frederick, 1st Earl of, i 209
Roberts, Sir John, Kt., i 34
Roberts, John, secretary to H. Pelham, ii 9 *n.*
Roberts, Martha, *see* Gibbon, Martha
Roberts, Sir Thomas, Bart., i 51; correspondence, i 55
Robertson, William, the historian, present at debate in H. of Commons on Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 5; impression of Pitt's eloquence, iii 6
Robinson, Lieut. S., correspondence, i 409, 457, 467
Robinson, Thomas, Sir, note on, mission to Frederick of Prussia, i 260, 262, ii 382; bad reception of, i 270; ambassador at Vienna, i 249; British representative at Aix-la-Chapelle, i 659, 663; N. desires to send to the Hague, ii 13; made Secretary of State, ii 194; leader of the H. of Commons, ii 217; returns to the Great Wardrobe, ii 198; against keeping Fox in the administration, 1756, ii 322; correspondence, ii 122
Robinson v. *Cox*, ii 466
Robinson, Sir John v. *Cumming*, ii 474
Robinson v. *Longe*, ii 430 *n.*
Robinson v. *Robinson*, ii 505 *n.*
Rochefort, Pitt's expedition against, iii 117 *n.*; declared practicable by the officers, iii 162; and by Anson and Hawke, iii 117 *n.*, 189; failure of, iii 116 sqq.; Anson on, iii 186; Pitt on causes of, iii 187, 189; H. on, iii 163, 171, 176
Rockingham, Charles Watson-Wentworth, 2nd Marquess of, note on, iii 447; ii 354; resignation stopped, 1757, ii 399; induces H. to oppose the Peace, iii 372, 449; advises N. not to embark in organised opposition, iii 380; follows the D. of Devonshire into retirement, iii 371; deprived of his Lord Lieutenancy,

iii 377; at dinner of the Whig leaders at the D. of Devonshire's, iii 381, 455; conversation with Pitt on the Wilkes affair, iii 501; Bute's overtures to the Opposition through, iii 503; summoned to London on Pitt's negotiation with George III, iii 527; interview with Pitt Oct. 1763, iii 545; promises support to Charles Yorke on his resignation, iii 540; approves Charles Yorke's behaviour in parting interview with George III, iii 548; endeavours to moderate the difference between Pitt and Charles Yorke, iii 552; correspondence, iii 545, 552
Rodney, Admiral George, brought forward by Anson, iii 114; bombards Havre, iii 138; correspondence, iii 374 *n.*
Rogers, Henry, rioter, i 134, 153
Rogers v. *Gibson*, ii 478 *n.*
Roman Catholic religion, maintenance of in Minorca, i 205
Roman Catholics, strength of at York, 1745, i 450; numbers in London, 1745, i 460; protection of in 1745, i 464; and the Marriage Act, ii 73; the Chancellor's jurisdiction over children of, ii 418; bill for securing Protestant purchasers of property of, rejected, ii 142; severe laws against not executed, i 450
Roman Law, *see* Law, Roman
Romans, King of the, election of, ii 3 sqq., 25 sqq., 33 sqq.
Romilly, Sir Samuel, on H.'s rapid despatch of business in Chancery, ii 508
Rooke, G. H., contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 208
Rooke, Mary, *see* Gibbon, Mary
Rosbach, Frederick's victory at, iii 119, 124
Rosse, Captain, i 358
Rotheram v. *Brown*, decree of H. appealed from, ii 478
Rouillé, Antoine, note on, proposal to Frederick to seize Hanover, iii 219
Row v. *Dawson*, ii 463
Royal family, exempted from Marriage Act, ii 60; management of, the K.'s prerogative, ii 48
Royston, militia riot at, iii 32
Royston, Viscount, title of, ii 78
Rumkissenseat v. *Barker*, ii 457
Russell, Col. Charles, of the Coldstreams, i 640; correspondence, ii 149
Russell, Sir Henry, Bart., of Swallowfield, notes of, i 56
Russell, Michael, of Dover, i 57 *n.*, ii 164
Russell, Mrs, of Dover, ii 164
Russell family at Dover, friendship with H., ii 563
Russia, British relations with, i 659, iii 116; British treaty with, 1742, i 293, 334; convention of 1747, i 382, 626; accession of England to treaty between Austria and, ii 7; H. and N. on, ii 23; treaty of 1755, ii 237, 259; Pitt's views on, ii 232, 240, 243; British alliance with superseded by Convention with Frederick, 1756, ii 274; treaty of St Petersburg with Austria, iii 116; league with Austria and France against Frederick, iii 127; position of, 1758, iii 196
Rutland, John, 3rd Duke of, H. desires to include in the cabinet, ii 102; resignation stopped, 1757, ii 399; dismissal from office of Lord Steward, iii 258
Ryall v. *Rowles*, ii 463, 492, 504
Ryder, Sir Dudley, Attorney-General, oath taken by the prisoners at Carlisle in the Scottish manner against opinion of, ii 460; speech on Lord Lovat's trial, i 581; counsel in *Chesterfield* v. *Janssen*, ii 454; raised to the Bench, ii 477; George II's refusal to give peerage to, ii 302

S

Sackville, Lord George, career and character of, iii 139; in command of detachment in Scotland, 1746, i 544; troubles in Ireland attributed to, ii 49; joins in attack upon the ministers on loss of Minorca, ii 290; intermediary between Gen. Yorke and Lord Holderness, iii 86; claim to military patronage refused, iii 140; support given to by Leicester House, iii 119, 140, ii 384; George III's partiality for, iii 257; situation in the army as the representative of Leicester House, iii 139; captious correspondence from the army with Lord Bute, iii 140; cabals against Prince Ferdinand, iii 245; conduct at Minden, iii 139, 235; motive of, Gen. Joseph Yorke's opinion of, iii 140; on his treatment by Prince Ferdinand, iii 235; sentence of court-martial on, iii 140; on Pitt's resignation, iii 288 *n.*; speech on the German War, Sir J. Yorke on, iii 340; correspondence, iii 235
St Aubyn, Sir John, correspondence, i 153
St Cast, disaster at, iii 126
St Clair, General, incapacity of, i 636; failure of expedition against Lorient, i 625
St David, Fort, captured by Lally, iii 233
St George, ship, i 226
St George's Hospital, legacy of H. to, iii 486
St James's Evening Post, printer of committed to prison by H., ii 522
St John's College, Cambridge, case of *Green* v. *Rutherford*, ii 463
St Leonards, Lord, wanting in the power of generalisation, ii 491; on H.'s decree in *Garth* v. *Cotton*, ii 451
St Louis, Fort of, capture of, iii 137
St Lucia, French fail to evacuate, ii 7; British conquest of, iii 295; surrendered at Peace of Paris, iii 374; Rodney on value of, iii 374

St Malo, expedition to Cherbourg and, failure of, iii 126; responsibility of Leicester House for, iii 118
St Petersburg, Treaty of, 1757, between Russia and Austria, iii 116
St Philip's Castle in Minorca, progress of attack upon, ii 305; capitulation of, ii 272
St Pierre, island of, granted to France as an *abri*, iii 271
St Severin, Comte de, French Minister of State, i 661; on his reasons for making the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, ii 15
St Thomas's Hospital, legacy of H. to, iii 486
St Vincent, French fail to evacuate, ii 7; conquest of, iii 295
Saladin, Monsieur, case of, i 77
Salkeld, Charles, solicitor, i 53
Salkeld, Robert, H.'s clerk, appointed to Clerkship of the Briefs, ii 118
Salkeld, William, Serjeant, i 53; H. collaborates in *Reports* of, ii 429 *n.*; vol. iii of stigmatized by H. as of no value, ii 430 *n.*
Sallier, Claude, philologist, note on, ii 186
Salter, Dr Samuel, note on, i 102 *n.*; contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 207; dedication of his work refused by H., ii 561; correspondence, i 267
Salvadore, Joseph, supporter of Bute in the City, iii 395
Sanderson, Bishop, on form of oaths, cited by H., ii 459
Sandwich, John, 4th Earl of, note on, promotion of opposed by Pitt, i 630; character of, iii 484; H. on, iii 391; disliked by George II, ii 87, detested by the D. of Grafton, ii 110; 1st Lord of the Admiralty, i 629; leaves direction of the navy to Anson, iii 114 *n.*; mission to Holland, i 628; private correspondence with N., i 630; objected to by Lord Harrington, iii 22 *n.*; dispute with N., i 633, 660 sqq.; opposes naval expedition to Nova Scotia, ii 8; factious conduct of, i 199; cabals with the D. of Bedford against N., ii 39; supporter of Fox, ii 188; D. of Cumberland's friendship for, ii 13, 44; gains the ascendant over the D. of Cumberland, ii 85 sqq.; dismissal of, 1751, ii 40, 115; 1st Lord of the Admiralty, iii 388; position in George Grenville's administration, iii 498; informs the D. of Bedford of Pitt's refusal to admit the latter to his administration, iii 471; appointed Secretary of State, iii 471; George III's support given to in candidature for the High Stewardship of Cambridge University, iii 257; Lord Chesterfield on, iii 484, 485; H. on, iii 561
Sandys, Samuel, 1st Lord, note on, i 253; dispute between H. and N. on advancement of, ii 253; supports grant for Hanoverian troops in office, i 292
San Severino, Prince of, Spanish envoy in England, declaration of against British advance in America, Pitt's reply to, iii 143; proposal of Spanish mediation and Pitt's answer to, iii 236
Sans Souci, Gen. Yorke's impressions of, iii 229
Santiago in Cuba, failure of Vernon at, i 195
Sardinia, British relations with, i 293, 321, 359, 386, ii 19
Saunders, Admiral, Sir Charles, note on, Anson's confidence in, iii 215; brought forward by Anson, iii 114; disapproves of the Marriage Act, ii 65; capture of Quebec, iii 138; conduct praised by H., iii 239
Saunderson, Sir William, i 188 *n.*
Savage, Richard, the poet, prosecution of, i 127; eulogistic verses on H., i 128
Savile of Medley, defies the Court of Chancery, ii 475
Saxe, Maréchal, commands French expedition to invade England, 1744, i 327; supports project of invasion, i 440; takes Brussels, i 509; nearly captured at battle of Lauffeld, i 646; head of the war party in France, i 654
Saxony, British relations with, i 386, ii 19; subsidies, i 344, 350; D'Argenson's opinion of, ii 3
Scarbrough, Richard, 2nd Earl of, i 162, 165, 179 *n.*
Scene of corruption discovered, A, ii 503 *n.*
Schäffer, Baron Carl, Swedish Minister at Paris, i 491; confidential relations with Puisieux, ii 165
Schaiblin, secretary to Joseph Yorke, death of, ii 153
Schism Act, ii 57 *n.*
Schomberg, Isaac, v. *College of Physicians*, ii 120
Schoolmasters, licensing of, i 124 *n.*
Schweidnitz, taken by the Prussians, iii 137, 210; capture by the Austrians, iii 267; surrender by the Austrians, iii 368
Schwerin, Marshal, severity of discipline of, iii 223
Schwickeldt, Hanoverian Minister, mission to Frederick of Prussia, i 265
Science, —, committed to the Fleet for marriage to a ward in chancery, ii 470
Scotland, political state of, 1746, i 513; discipline and governance, i 530 sqq.; reform and progress, i 588 sqq.; results of H.'s reforms in, i 617 sqq.; completion of the union of the two kingdoms and regeneration of, i 601, iii 114, *see also* Union, Act of Union; advance in prosperity, i 621 sqq.; administration of justice, reforms instituted by Duncan Forbes, ii 532 sqq.; Marriage Act not extended to, ii 72; confusion of records of, ii 535; ignorance of the English judges of the laws of, ii 481; appeals from to the H. of Lords, ii 539, 541;

under H., ii 481 sqq.; judges of, *see* Judges
Scott, Captain, holds Fort William against the Rebels, i 511
Scott, Sir Walter, on Dr Cameron's execution, i 538
Scrope, Captain, at defence of Minorca, ii 292
Search, right of, upon the seas, i 185; supported by H., i 187
Secker, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury (Bishop of Oxford), i 236 *n.*; discourse with H., i 279; opposes Act restricting functions of Episcopalian Church in Scotland, i 598–9; advanced by H., ii 559; promoted to Canterbury through H., i 599 *n.*; supports N.'s continuance in office at George III's accession, iii 307; correspondence, ii 127, 133
Secretary of State, power to issue warrants, H. on, iii 463; Charles Yorke on, iii 509–10
Secretaries of State, the two, i 638 *n.*
Secret service, increase of sums allotted to under Bute, iii 378
Segar, Sir William, Garter, i 31; imprisonment of, i 32
Selden, John, definition of equity, ii 421
Selhurst, Alice, *see* Gibbon, Alice
Selhurst, Cheney, i 34
Selkirk, Earl of, v. *Duke of Hamilton*, ii 539
Selwyn, George, anecdote of, i 562 *n.*
Selwyn v. *Honeywood*, ii 474
Serjeants-at-Law, presentation of, i 141
Settlement of territory, true, H. on, ii 462
Settlement cases, waste of money in, i 128
Severn, Catherine, wife of John Somers, i 69
Seville, Treaty of, i 201
Seychelles, Mons., Intendant de Flandres, ii 24
Seydlitz, General Friedrich, note on, Gen. Yorke's account of, iii 224–5
Shannon, Earl of, *see* Boyle, Hon. Henry
Shebbeare, Dr John, career and character of, ii 63 *n.*; novel written by against the Marriage Act, ii 62; punished for publishing, ii 137; Pratt urges the right of the jury to give general verdict in case of, iii 464 *n.*; attacks H. in the *Monitor*, ii 380 sqq.; receives pension from George III, iii 258
Sheep stealing, made felony by statute, i 131
Sheffield v. *Duchess of Buckingham*, ii 476
Shelburne, William, 2nd Earl of, on Byng's execution, ii 345 *n.*; on George III's 1st declaration to the Council, iii 262; position in George Grenville's administration, iii 498; Lord Egremont's jealousy of, iii 514; on Pitt, ii 277 *n.*, iii 153, 364; untrustworthy character of his accounts and testimony, ii 70 *n.*
Sheldon, Captain, i 303
Shelley, Jack, dismissed from the Customs, iii 442
Shelley, Mr, correspondence, iii 564
Shelley's Case, ii 426
Shepard, Mr, in the Cambridgeshire election, ii 161
Shepheard, v. *Lord Montfort*, ii 478 *n.*
Sheppard, Jack, prosecution of, i 79
Shergold v. *Holloway*, i 129
Sheridan, Thomas, Jacobite, note on, i 544
Sheriffs, in Scotland, increased remuneration and jurisdiction of, i 594
Sherlock, Thomas, Bishop of Salisbury and of London, declines Archbishopric of Canterbury, ii 80; advanced by H., ii 559; impression upon H. of sermons of, ii 559 *n.*
Shippen, William, leader of the Jacobites, refusal to support motion for removal of Walpole, i 253 and *n.*; praise of H.'s justice, i 98
Shipwrecked, Act defending from plunder, ii 52
Short Demurrer to the Jews, A, ii 129 *n.*
Shower's *Reports*, stigmatized by H. as of no value, ii 430 *n.*
Sidney, Algernon, i 15
Silesia, ceded to Frederick of Prussia, i 319; Joseph Yorke's description of, iii 210
Silesian mortgage, confiscated by Frederick of Prussia, ii 7
Silhouette, Étienne de, note on, i 392
Sinclair's Regiment, captured by the Rebels, i 452
Skelton, Col., at Fontenoy, i 407
Slaves, legal status of in England, ii 472; not enfranchised by setting foot in Great Britain, ii 472–3; a contrary decision by Lord Mansfield, ii 474; but followed again by Lord Stowell, ii 474; baptism of does not enfranchise, ii 472, 473
Slave trade, in Scotland, i 590
Slingelandt, Receiver General of Holland, iii 116
Smith, Admiral, conduct on the condemnation of Byng, ii 343–4; on Byng's cowardice, ii 347 *n.*
Smith, Captain, aide-de-camp to Lord George Sackville at Minden, iii 235
Smith, Captain, of Dover, i 226
Smith, Capt. Edward, account of attack upon Porto Cabello, i 311
Smith, John, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, ii 136
Smith, Ex parte, ii 519
Smith v. *Smith*, ii 516, 519
Smugglers Act, i 138, 151
Smythe, —, of Dover, i 16
Smythe, Sir Sidney Stafford, opinion in the Lords against Lord Chancellor Henley's decree in *Drury* v. *Drury*, iii 389; Commissioner of the Great Seal, 1756, ii 338
Snee v. *Prescott*, ii 493 *n.*

Sodor and Man, Bishop of v. *Earl of Derby*, ii 463
Solar, Bailli de, Bute's negotiations with France transacted through, iii 293
Somers, Elizabeth, *see* Jekyll, Elizabeth, Lady
Somers, John, Baron Somers, Lord Chancellor, i 69; connection with Lord Hardwicke, library of, i 70; destruction of his papers, ii 144, 179, 181, 182; cited by H., ii 447
Somers, John, of Whiteladies, i 69
Somers, Margaret, wife of James Harris, i 69
Somers, Mary, wife of Charles Cocks, i 69
Somers, Richard, i 69
Somers, Seabright, i 69
Somerset, Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of, "the Proud Duke," friendship for H., i 114, 243; on election candidates, i 242; letters to H., i 114, 242
Somerset, Duke of v. *France and others*, i 114 *n.*
Some Considerations upon Clandestine Marriages, ii 60 *n.*
Sommerset v. *Stewart*, ii 474
Sondes, Lewis, 1st Lord, correspondence, ii 593
Sorresby v. *Hollins*, ii 443
Soubise, Prince de, obtains reinforcements owing to the Hanover neutrality, iii 120, 178
South Sea Company, claims against by Spain, i 186; collapse of, i 73; scandals of, i 147
Spain, British relations with, i 625; dispute with, 1738, i 185; war with, 1739, i 195; Convention with, 1739, i 187, 190; debate on, i 188; commercial treaty with, 1750, ii 7; settlement of disputes, ii 25, 30; relations with, 1754, ii 255; observes strict neutrality, 1756, ii 274; Pitt proposes in vain cession of Gibraltar and other advantages to gain, 1757, iii 123, 165; demand for the *équilibre* in America, H. on, iii 241; attitude of, 1759, iii 142, 150; further negotiations with, iii 243 sqq.; declaration of war against, 1762, iii 293, 295; N. and H. on, iii 340 sqq.; relations with France, iii 143, 151, 269, 282; *see also* Charles III, K. of Spain
Spencer, Lord Charles, M.P. for Oxfordshire, stays away from debate on general warrants, iii 563
Spencer v. *Franco*, i 130
Spey, passage of the, i 511, 519
Spitalfields, riots at, i 131
"Splendid isolation," impossibility of policy of, i 293, 296
Sporken, Hanoverian general, iii 185
Stace v. *Mabbot*, ii 476
Stade, the D. of Cumberland's retreat to, iii 119, 167, 169; reference to Amherst's account of, iii 119 *n.*; Gen. Zastrow's opinion of, iii 119 *n.*; Col. Joseph Yorke on, iii 119; predicament of the troops at, iii 185
Stair, John, 2nd Earl of, note on, i 306; negotiation with Bolingbroke, i 368; commands British forces in Germany, i 292 sqq.; military movements of before Dettingen, i 314; commands British troops at Dettingen, i 297; project of march to Paris, i 306, 319; rejection of, i 354; complaints of training in the army, i 310; unjust treatment of, i 320; throws up his command, i 298; "highland mad," i 534; distrusts loyalty of the Scots, i 451; letter to H., i 310
Stampe, Anne, daughter of Simon Stampe, i 9
Stanhope, James, 1st Earl, note on, ii 12; downfall of his administration and death, i 73; Lord Townshend's faint praise of diplomacy of, i 679
Stanhope v. *Cope*, ii 468
Stanley, Hans, note on, ii 405, iii 268; H. on, iii 327; despatches of, iii 277, 318, 327; H. on, iii 320; negotiations at Paris, 1761, iii 268; declares the impossibility of France ceding the Newfoundland Fishery, iii 320; convinced of Choiseul's desire for peace, iii 282; remonstrance to Pitt on the style of his despatches, iii 284; Pitt's reception of, iii 321; return to England, iii 277; on Pitt's conduct of the negotiations, iii 285
Stapilton v. *Stapilton*, ii 451
State perjury, i 146
Statute Law of England, offences made felonies by, i 131; extended to Ireland, iii 11; H. on exorbitant growth of, ii 263; H.'s interpretation of influenced by equitable considerations, ii 443
Steele, Sir Richard, case of, note on, iii 489, 502
Steinberg, Ernst v., Hanoverian minister of state, i 668, ii 35, iii 170, 173
Steinberg, Baron G. F. v., Hanoverian envoy at Vienna, i 668; asks terms in vain from Vienna for George II as Elector, iii 173
Stephens, Sir Philip, note on, ii 356
Stevenson, pugilist, said to have attended Bute as a guard, iii 432
Steward, Lord High, procession of, *see* Yorke, Philip, Earl of Hardwicke, Lord Chancellor
Stewart, Charles, of Ardsheil, Jacobite, i 556 *n.*
Stewart, Sir James, of Goodtrees, note on, i 552
Stewart, —, rebel officer, death of, i 539
Stirling, relieved by the King's forces, 1746, i 426, 494
Stone, Andrew, note on, i 254; secretary to N., i 362, 379; mediator between the Pelhams, ii 117; sub-governor to the P. of Wales, failure of charge of Jacobitism against, ii 47–8; indignation at attack

upon H. in the *Monitor*, ii 384; advises N. to retire from office at George III's accession, iii 261, 307; on proposal to supply Pitt's place with Fox, iii 328 *n.*; deserts N. after his resignation, iii 434; at conference at Newcastle House concerning H. and Gen. Yorke, iii 103; correspondence, i 389, 634, ii 117, 118
Stone, George, Primate of Ireland, political aims of, ii 50, 388; omitted from list of lords justices, ii 50
Stonhouse, Dr, H. refuses preferment to, ii 583
Story, Mr Justice, on H.'s decree in *Le Neve* v. *Le Neve*, ii 448
Stoughton v. *Reynolds*, i 124
Stowe, Mr, counsel for the plaintiff in *Huckwell* v. *the Messengers of the Secretary of State*, iii 509, 510
Stowell, Lord, judgment concerning emancipation of slaves on arrival in England, ii 474
Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, note on, ii 152
Strange, Sir John, M.R., note on, i 54, 584; H.'s friendship for, ii 564; decree reversed by H., ii 428; *Reports* of, H. contributes reports of his arguments to, ii 429 *n.*, 552; opposes voluntary national subscriptions in 1745, i 478
Stratfold, Deborah, *see* Gibbon, Deborah
Strathallan, 4th Viscount, note on, i 524; takes part in the Rebellion, i 498
Strathbogie, affair of, i 516
Street, John, rioter, i 134
Strode, Col. John, Lieut. Governor of Dover Castle, i 19
Stuart, Andrew, tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 528; comparison of the methods of H. and Mansfield, ii 493
Stuart, General, on Byng's Council of War, ii 292
Stuarts of Appin, join the Y. Pretender, i 451
Subsidies, foreign, i 334; policy of, ii 2 sqq.; criticised by H., ii 17 sqq.; Pitt's opposition to, ii 231, 232; for Cologne, ii 108
Suffolk, Earl of, administration of his will, i 124
Sugar trade and West Indies, H. on importance of, iii 347
Sunderland, Robert Spencer, 2nd Earl of, note on, iii 421
Sunderland, Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of, i 73, 174 *n.*; compels George I to make him Groom of the Stole, ii 225; negotiation with Bolingbroke, i 368
Supplement or review, bills of, order of H. concerning, ii 517
Surajah Dowlah, makes peace with Clive, ii 386; perpetrates the outrage of the Black Hole of Calcutta, ii 273; defeat by Clive at Calcutta, ii 386; defeat and death of, iii 169
Sutherland, William, 18th Earl of, refrains from joining royal forces in 1745, i 449; votes against Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill, i 613
Swale, Mr, iii 36
Swannock v *Lyford*, ii 463
Swartzenburg, General, commands Dutch troops in England, 1745, i 455
Sweden, relations with, ii 7; position of, 1758, iii 196
Swetenham, Capt., captured by the Y. Pretender, i 452
Swiss troops in foreign service, i 300

T

Talbot, Catherine, contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 208; on Lady Anson, ii 580; on H. in his last illness, iii 483; correspondence, ii 557
Talbot, Charles, Lord Chancellor, i 110; compared with H., i 116; opinion concerning legal status of slaves, ii 472–3; obtains the Great Seal, i 117; opposes Quakers' Tithes Bill, i 150; dispute with the Bishop of London, i 127; extolled for his genius and virtue, ii 521; death, i 157; said to have been killed by overwork, ii 501; offices obtained for his family, ii 181; increased authority of precedents under, ii 423; H. refuses to follow opinion of, ii 428; decrees overruled, ii 480
Talbot, William, 2nd Baron, note on character of, i 252, iii 258; carries Frederick P. of Wales's programme of government to the Tories, iii 446; opposes the Lords' censure of *Manners, a Satire*, i 220; supports Lord Lovat, i 582, 586; kissed by Lord Lovat, i 583; raises dispute between the two Houses on trial of Lord Lovat, i 574; altercation with Sir W. Yonge, i 583; interrupts Murray of Broughton's evidence, i 582; appointment of as Lord Steward, H.'s disapproval of, iii 258
Tankerville, Lord, case of, relied upon by Pratt in his judgment in the Wilkes case, iii 493
Tatnall, Valentine, Mayor of Dover, removed by Cromwell, i 16, 18
Taxation, principles of, H. on, iii 382; transference of burden from the upper to the lower classes at the Restoration, iii 34
Taylor, Joe, of Bridewell, i 97
Taylor, Michael Angelo, on H.'s rapid despatch of business in Chancery, ii 508
Teachers in Scotland, required to take oath of allegiance, i 597
Temple, Richard, Earl, note on, ii 231; ill received by the D. of Bedford at Woburn, ii 252; attacks H. and the administration in the Lords, ii 259; repartee to H., 1755, ii 260 *n.*; 1st Lord

of the Admiralty, 1756, ii 280; incapacity and uneasy situation of, iii 160; attacks clause in the K.'s Speech thanking the K. for the Hanoverian troops, ii 360; supports Byng's cause, ii 342, 365; motives of, ii 345; presses George II to pardon Byng, ii 343; attempts to bully the K., ii 365; George II's antipathy to, ii 364; satisfied of Byng's guilt, ii 344; Lord Privy Seal, 1757, ii 370; speech in support of the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 14; H.'s notes of, iii 17 *n.*; insults the judges, iii 18; refers questions to the judges, iii 17; quarrel in the H. of Lords with Lord Lyttelton, iii 18; abominable manner of obtaining the Garter, 2nd Lord H. on, iii 57 *n.*; threatens N., iii 57; Pitt's demand for the Garter for, iii 23, 56 sqq.; refused by George II, iii 57 sqq.; resigns the Privy Seal, iii 23, 87; apologises to George II, iii 26; is promised the Garter, H.'s satisfaction at, iii 26, 90; accepts again the Privy Seal, iii 26; visits H., iii 91; and intrigue to make Lord Bute Secretary of State, iii 265; supports Pitt in the Cabinet demanding declaration of war against Spain, iii 274 sqq.; speeches at the Cabinet, iii 272–3, 278, 326; memorandum to the K. demanding declaration of war against Spain, of Pitt and, iii 275; resignation of, iii 280, 330; accompanies Pitt in triumphal visit to the City, iii 281; as author of the *North Briton*, iii 400–1; forwardness in support of Wilkes, iii 491; Pitt on, iii 508; H. on, iii 488; applies for a writ of *Habeas Corpus* to Sir Charles Pratt for Wilkes, iii 460; refused admittance to Wilkes at the Tower, iii 460, 491; correspondence with Wilkes, note on, iii 460; George III's proscription of, iii 458, 496; Pitt's declaration of inviolable attachment to, iii 508; conversation with H. on Pitt's intentions, iii 454; conversation with the D. of Devonshire on Pitt's intentions, iii 455; announces alliance of Pitt and the Whig Lords, iii 381, 456; at dinner of the Whig leaders at the Duke of Devonshire's, iii 381, 455; satisfaction with the Whig Lords, iii 497; desire for a confidential union with Charles Yorke, of Pitt and, iii 498 sqq.; satisfaction with Charles Yorke, iii 553; conversation with Lord Royston on Pitt, iii 556; correspondence, ii 204, 275 *n.*, iii 460

Test, The, ii 373; H. and Pitt satirised in, ii 375

Thayer v. *Gould*, ii 427

Thiel, Du, negotiation of, i 679

Thierheim, General, Frederick on, iii 202

Thompson, Anthony, *attaché* to British embassy at Paris, i 529 *n.*

Thompson, Sir William, Solicitor-General, dismissal of, i 72

Thomson, James, the poet, exclusion from office of Secretary of Briefs, ii 561 *n.*

Thornton, Captain, i 521

Thornton, Catherine, i 12

Thornton, John, i 12

Three Monosyllables, The, iii 44

Thurloe Papers, inscription of to H., ii 561

Thurlow, Lord Chancellor, opinion of H. as Chief Justice, i 121 *n.*; discontinues early sittings of House of Lords for appeals, ii 502; unmerited reflections upon, ii 569

Thynne, Thomas, of Longleat, note on murder of, ii 109

Tickell, Thomas, the poet, tribute to H., i 75

Ticonderoga, Fort, failure of Abercromby's attempt at, iii 137, 198 *n.*

Tillotson, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, on obligation of an oath, ii 459

Timber, preservation of, for benefit of contingent remainders, ii 449

Tithes, proceedings for non-payment of, i 149; assessment of, in the City of London by the Lord Chancellor, ii 418

Tittenhanger, acquired by Charles Yorke by his first marriage, ii 574

Tobago, occupied by the French, ii 7

Tonson v. *Walker*, ii 438, 464

Torgau, Frederick's victory at, iii 153

Torrington, George, 1st Viscount, father of Admiral Byng, ii 269

Torrington, 2nd Viscount, Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard, i 507

Tournai, capture by the French, i 388, 410, 412

Tournelle, Mme de la, i 356

Tovey, De Blossiers, note on, discovery of, ii 128

Townshend, Charles, 2nd Viscount, i 73; answer to Lord Stanhope, i 679

Townshend, Hon. Charles, attacks Marriage Act, ii 61, 66; marriage of, ii 62; introduces the Militia Bill, ii 261; appointed Secretary for War, iii 266; at debate on general warrants, iii 563

Townshend, Charles, later Lord Bayning, note on, iii 491, 546; against Wilkes's privilege, iii 546

Townshend, Hon. George, later 1st Marquis, supports attack on late ministry in Minorca inquiry, ii 358–9, 361–2; challenges Lord Leicester for speaking disrespectfully of militia, iii 29 *n.*

Townshend, Thomas, afterwards Baron Sydney, note on, iii 447; conference with Pitt, iii 447

Townshend v. *Windham*, ii 425

Traquair, Lord, implicated in the Rebellion, i 582

"Travel of Youths Abroad," essay by H. in the *Spectator*, i 55

Travers, —, superintendent at Blenheim, cause of, i 224

Treason, Act of Edward III, ii 415; Act making correspondence with Pretender's sons, i 327, 342; Act for punishment of in the Highlands, i 536; good results from, i 550–2; law of England of introduced into Scotland at the Union, ii 482, 542; complications resulting from, ii 482
Treby, Sir George, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, note on, ii 447, iii 9; cited by H., ii 447
Trevor, Hon. Robert, i 339; British minister at the Hague, i 354; instructions, i 262; on Hanoverian Neutrality of 1741, i 273; concludes Quadruple Alliance, i 335 *n.*; letter of, i 191
Trevor, Hon. Richard, Bishop of Durham, declines to follow N. at his resignation, iii 434
Trevor, Thomas, Lord, note on, ii 424; on the weight of precedents, ii 424
Triumvirate, The, i 102
Truchsess, General F., Prussian ambassador, i 245 *n.*
Trusts and uses, history of, ii 435; invention of, ii 551; H. on nature of, as "honorary things," ii 468; equity rules well-defined in cases of, ii 441, 443, 554; multiplication and extension of, cause of increase in business in the Court of Chancery, ii 555; executory and executed, construction of, ii 433
Trustees, rights and duties to preserve contingent remainders, ii 449 sqq.; compensation from beneficiaries to and financial arrangements between disallowed by H., ii 468; notice to agents or, ii 448
Trye family, i 107
Tucker v. *Phipps*, ii 425
Tuckfield v. *Buller*, ii 428
Tullibardine, William, Marquis of, note on, i 437; accompanies Young Pretender to Scotland, 1745, i 441
Turner, Sir Charles, i 136
Turner, Robert, i 14
Turnpike riots, i 92, 155
Turton, Mr, choice of for the Commission of the Peace, ii 547
Tweeddale, John, 4th Marquis of, supports Convention of Hanau, i 323; depreciation of the Rebellion, i 460; obstructs measures for suppressing Rebellion, i 418; resignation, i 429; speaks in support of Heritable Jurisdictions of Scotland Bill and proposes amendment, i 613–4
Twiss, H., untrustworthiness of his account of Chancery delays, ii 503–4
Typographical Antiquities, inscription of to H., ii 561
Tyrawley, 2nd Baron, note on, refuses to command American expedition, i 262, 263
Tyrconnell, Earl of, French Ambassador at Berlin, ii 7, 150

U

Union of England with Scotland, H. as constant promoter of, iii 462; H.'s desire to complete by assimilating the laws, ii 437, 482; assimilation of treason laws, ii 542; *see also* Scotland
Uses and trusts, invention of, ii 551; history of, ii 435; construction of, ii 550
Uses, statute of, overridden by equity, ii 435
Usury, statute of, ii 453; attempts to avoid, ii 441; repealed, ii 455
Utrecht, Peace of, H. on, i 59; Lord Bolingbroke's grounds of defence of, iii 391; compared with the Peace of Paris, iii 150, 272, 285, 289, 369, 418 sqq.

V

Valory, Marquis Guy de, French ambassador at Berlin, i 269
Vanbrugh, Lieut. Charles, note on, i 403; killed at Fontenoy, i 393, 395 sqq.; letter of, i 389
Vanbrugh, Henrietta, Lady, note on, i 396, 403; letter of, i 398
Vane, William, 2nd Viscount, i 254 and *n.*
Vellinghausen, Prince Ferdinand's victory at, iii 267
Vernon, Admiral Edward, *protégé* of Frederick, Prince of Wales, i 639; failure of W. Indian expedition, i 195, 256, 276; failure to intercept Spanish treasure ships, i 225; premature announcement of victories, i 255; capture of Cartagena, i 254; at Portobello, i 267–8; suspected conduct of, and dismissal, i 196, 257; motion for production of his instructions, i 197, 199; commands in the Downs, 1745, i 442; opposes Jews' Naturalisation Bill, ii 55
Vernon, Mr, iii 440
Vernon, Thomas, *Reports* of, H. on untrustworthiness of, ii 431
Vernon v. *Vaudrey*, ii 495
Versailles, Treaty of, 1756, ii 274, 296, iii 115
Vesey, Francis, sen., *Reports* of, ii 431 *n.*
Vestry, right to preside at meetings of, i 124
Vienna, Treaty of (1732), ii 30
Villeinage in England, ii 472
Villiers, Lord, dismissal of, iii 442
Viner, Charles, tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 526 *n.*
Viry, Count, Sardinian minister, consulted by Fox in his proposal to exchange Gibraltar for Minorca, ii 305; mission to N. on the subject of the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 43; on Holderness's intrigue in the affair of the *Inconnue*, iii 79; report to N. of Lord Bute's conversation about Pitt, iii 54; advice to N. to retire at George III's accession, iii 261, 305; intermediary between Bute

and N., iii 305; and intrigue to make Bute Secretary of State, iii 265; Bute's negotiations with France conducted through, iii 293; granted pension on the Irish Civil List for his services in the Peace, iii 378 *n.*
Voltaire, Joseph Yorke makes acquaintance of, ii 150; intervention on behalf of Byng, ii 343; witticism on Byng's execution, ii 343

W

Wade, Field-marshal, George, note on, i 255, 444; roads in Scotland, i 541; opposes Lord Stair's project of marching to Paris, i 354; in command in Flanders, 1744, i 330, 345; relations with the allied generals, i 343, 352, 361; ill-health of, i 355, 360; preserves good discipline, i 352; on seriousness of the Rebellion, i 451; movements against the rebels, i 467, 471, 473, 480; slow progress of, i 477, 484; correspondence, i 360
Wager, Admiral Sir Charles, 1st Lord of the Admiralty, i 164 *n.*, 225, 248
Wages, magistrate's warrant to compel payment of, i 129
Waldeck, Prince of, at Fontenoy, i 404, 408 *n.*; general of the allied army, i 627; command of the Dutch troops at battle of Lauffeld, i 641 sqq.; obstructive conduct of, i 649
Waldegrave, James, 2nd Earl, blames Fox's attack upon H., ii 70; censures publicity of expedition to America, 1754, ii 257; remonstrates with the Princess and Prince of Wales upon their conduct, 1756, ii 296; communicates the K.'s appointment of Bute to Groom of the Stole to the Princess and Prince of Wales, ii 314; on Pitt's motives in defending Byng, ii 345 *n.*; on Pitt's factious conduct, ii 361; brings N. the King's orders to form an administration with Fox, ii 387; conversation with George II on N. and H., ii 388; applied to by the K. to form administration, ii 368; collapse of his administration, ii 368; on Anson's return to the admiralty, ii 370; Bute makes overtures to, iii 384; on Fox, ii 188, 275; on Pitt, ii 191, 363; on Bute, ii 200 *n.*; on George II, iii 155, 157; shallow and unfriendly observations on H., ii 258 *n.*; criticised by John Nicholls, ii 567 *n.*
Waldegrave-Fox administration, fiasco of, ii 399; H. on, ii 390
Wales, Augusta, Princess of, hurried away from Hampton Court in childbirth, i 169; jointure, i 168; reconciled to George II on the Prince's death, ii 43; appointed Regent under the Regency Bill, ii 45; instigates hatred of the D. of Cumberland, ii 44; hostility to Fox, ii 217; becomes hostile to the government owing to the inclusion of Fox, ii 200, 249; Pitt's connection with, ii 201, 203, 276; factious conduct blamed by H., ii 251; proposes to sell her hostility to the Government for further provision for her children, ii 251; Lord Bute gains ascendant over, ii 250 *n.*, 251; said to have brought Bute into the P. of Wales's service, ii 252; supposed criminal intimacy with Bute, ii 200; hostility to H. and N., ii 297; continued opposition to the Government, ii 309; angry conversation with Princess Amelia, ii 307; Lord Waldegrave remonstrates with upon her conduct, ii 296; conduct censured by the Archbishop of Canterbury, ii 307; presses appointment of Bute to Groom of the Stole, ii 258, 296; obtains it, ii 275, 314; attitude towards Pitt and the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 51; opposes the sending of reinforcements to the D. of Cumberland or Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, iii 118; responsibility for disastrous expeditions to St Malo and Cherbourg, iii 118; bad influence upon George III, iii 256; indecent reflexions in the *North Briton* upon Bute and, iii 459; emblems burnt by the mob of Bute and, iii 461
Wales, Frederick, Prince of, heads the opposition to Walpole, i 161; dispute concerning his allowance, i 162; hurries away the Princess from Hampton Court in childbirth, i 169; quarrel with the King, i 161; communications with George II, i 164, 167, 169, 172 sqq., 177; private conversation with H., i 170; dismissal from the King's palace, i 177, 181; notice not to go to the Court of, i 182; real causes of the quarrel with the King unknown, project of excluding from the succession, i 179; offer to be chief mourner at the Queen's funeral declined, i 182; endeavours to gain support of Tories for Lord Granville, i 336; applies for command of army, 1745, i 460; obstructs Government measures for suppressing Rebellion, i 417; refuses to support legislation for Scotland, i 595 *n.*, 606, 614; cold reception of Anson after his victory, 1747, i 639; waiting for opportunities to blame, i 631; denounces the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, i 666; instigates calumnies against the D. of Cumberland, i 533, ii 44; programme of Government, ii 42; communicated to the Tories, iii 446; hostility to H., ii 43; opposes Mutiny Bill, ii 84; and baptism of his child, ii 93; death of, ii 43
Wales, George, Prince of; *see* George III
Wall, General, Richard, note on, iii 251; sent to England to renew good relations with Spain, i 625; N.'s communications with, ii 110; control of Spanish

diplomacy under Ferdinand VI, iii 142; warnings to the British ambassadors concerning British depredations, iii 142; Pitt's despatch for dealing with the Spanish complaints, iii 151; H. on diminished influence of, iii 251; driven into attitude of hostility to England, iii 144; repudiates hostile intentions in the Family Compact, iii 283; correspondence, iii 283
Waller, Sir William, depredations of, i 9
Wallis, Mr, counsel for the plaintiff in *Huckwell* v. *the Messengers of the Secretary of State*, iii 509
Wallis v. *Hodson*, ii 487
Walmesley v. *Borth*, ii 474, 479
Walpole, Horace, 1st Lord, i 162 *n.*, 233, ii 297; regard of H. for, ii 29; desired by H. to remain at the Hague, i 192; reflections upon N., i 240; assists to calm disputes between Walpole and N., i 240; excites animosities between the Pelham brothers, i 630; describes apathy of the people in Rebellion, i 419; foreign policy of, ii 6 *n.*, 29–30; on policy of foreign subsidies, ii 3; memorandum on importance of alliance with Prussia, i 650; on negotiations abroad, i 251; defends conduct of the Dutch, i 387 *n.*; values himself on his political writings and sagacity, i 650 *n.*, ii 30; reproves Fox for his attack on H., ii 64, 131; advocates inclusion of D. of Cumberland in the Council of Regency, ii 199 *n.*; negotiation with Pitt, 1755, ii 196; approves the Militia Bill, ii 262; discontent of, ii 241 *n.*; refusal to support the Government, ii 29, 31; obtains his peerage, ii 297; correspondence, i 240, 251, 655, ii 131, 297 sqq., 307, 559 *n.*
Walpole, Horace, the younger, afterwards 4th Earl of Orford, on leniency of Government after Culloden, i 538; opposes militia grant, 1745, i 417; on the King's conduct in 1745, i 418; on Anson's victory in 1747, i 625; abuse of H. and the Marriage Act, ii 63; on Byng, ii 270–1 *n.*, 343 sqq.; on the loss of Minorca, ii 268, 352 *n.*; abuse of Anson, ii 269; on H.'s opposition to the Militia Bill, ii 265 *n.*; on the failure of the Militia Act, iii 29 *n.*; on the formation of the Pitt-Newcastle ministry, ii 371 *n.*; on H. and the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 17 *n.*; on the *Inconnue* incident, iii 24 *n.*; on the general unanimity in carrying on the war, iii 137; on Pitt's reluctance to conclude a peace, iii 150, 286; value of his accounts of parliamentary debates, ii 65 *n.*; quotes opinion of H., ii 200 *n.*; story of George Selwyn, i 562 *n.*; conversation with William Cole on Lady Hardwicke, ii 566; on Herring, Archbishop of York, i 423; on Lord Granville, i 430; on Pitt's egotism, iii 27; on N.'s eccentricities, i 657 *n.*; on Charles Yorke, iii 480; on Charles Yorke's speech in the H. of Commons against the Privilege, iii 478; on Col. Joseph Yorke, ii 575 *n.*; on H., ii 63, 279 *n.*, 558, 567 *n.*, iii 17 *n.*, 115 *n.*, 371, 374; cause of calumnies and abuse of H., i 569 *n.*
Walpole, Sir Robert, dismissal of (1717), i 73; administration of, 1737–42, i 157; beginning of, i 73; addition to George II's civil list, H. on, iii 246; financial extravagance in time of peace, ii 6, 23; increase of national debt, ii 18; refrains from lowering interest on national debt on account of its unpopularity, ii 76; and the Quakers, i 149; prosecutions of corporations opposed to him, i 291, ii 541; H.'s remonstrance to on delay in appointing a judge, ii 540; offers Great Seal to H., i 158; conduct in the quarrel between the King and Prince of Wales, i 162 sqq.; refuses to attempt reconciliation between the King and Prince, i 172; motives of, i 175; whittles down the bill of penalties for the Porteous riots, i 184; communications with the Pretender's agents, i 202, 204 *n.*; meaning of, i 529 *n.*; false notions of conducting the war, i 191; no fixed plan of hostilities, i 250; for peace at any price, i 186; supports the King's foreign policy, i 204; acquiesces in Hanoverian neutrality, i 191; attempt to obtain cession of Silesia for Frederick, i 203; negotiations with Spain, i 217, 218; foreign policy justified, i 435; his despondency and complaints, i 191, 222; suspicions instilled into him of H. and N., i 192; differences with N., i 193, 238, 248, 251; deference to H.'s opinion, i 228; motives in appointing Lord Hervey Privy Seal, i 232 *n.*; motion for removal from office, i 199; account of debate on, i 252; Excise Bill, i 98; defeat on, i 101; overtures to the P. of Wales, i 204; fall of, i 205; causes of, i 278, 318; opposition to, later condemned by its promoters, i 189 *n.*; created Earl of Orford, i 205; reminds Pulteney in the House of Lords of their insignificance, i 280; abortive attempt to impeach for corruption, i 289; influence over Henry Pelham, i 635; detaches H. Pelham from N., i 629; opposition to Lord Granville, i 367; dissuades the King from supporting Granville, i 336; supports the Pelhams against Granville, i 278; letter of advice to N., 1743, i 337, 340; letter to H. Pelham, i 281; gives his support in favour of Hanover troops, i 326; prophesies another Jacobite attempt, i 185 *n.*; character, i 205; Bolingbroke's charge of treachery, i 368; Lord Bath's admiration of, ii 168; ignorance of history, i 100; foundation of his fame, i 187; on

patronage, i 287; on imprudence of writing in a passion, i 670; correspondence, i 96 *n.*, 337, 340, ii 540
Walpole, Hon. Thomas, account of Pitt's conversation, iii 430; conversation with Pitt on Wilkes and the privilege, iii 543; correspondence, iii 543
Walsh, John, note on, iii 233
Walsingham, Sir Francis, issue of warrants by as Secretary of State, iii 510
Walton v. *Tryon*, ii 429
Wandewash, Coote's victory at, iii 152
Wanson Farm, i 39; visited by Charles Yorke, ii 164
Warburg, victory of Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick at, iii 153
Warburton, William, Bishop of Gloucester, collaborates in *The Legal Judicature in Chancery Stated*, i 95; dispute with Thomas Edwards, i 213; relations with Montesquieu, ii 177, 186; friendship with Charles Yorke, ii 143; advanced by H., ii 559–60; dedication of the *Divine Legation* to H., ii 561; on Charles Yorke's speech in the H. of Commons against the Privilege, iii 478; on Pitt, iii 364; correspondence, i 466, ii 140, 572, iii 364, 478
Ward, John, expelled the H. of Commons for forgery, iii 490
Ward, Philip, H.'s friendship for, ii 564
Ward v. *Turner*, ii 455
Ward holding, abolished in Scotland, i 595; Lord Glenorchy on, i 604
Wards and Liveries, Court of, former jurisdiction over infants and lunatics, ii 469; abolished by Charles II, ii 469
Wardlow, —, warrant issued against for marrying a ward of Chancery, ii 475
Warrants, power of Secretary of State to issue, iii 463; H. on legality of general, iii 463; debate on in the H. of Commons, iii 479, 562 sqq.; declared illegal by Sir Charles Pratt, iii 460, 511; prohibition of supported by Charles Yorke, iii 464
Warren, Commodore, at attack on Louisburg, i 436
Washington, George, defeated and taken prisoner by the French, ii 255
Wasner, Baron, Austrian ambassador in London, i 323, 668; demands assurance of subsidies for Austria, i 339
Watson, Charles, Vice-Admiral, note on, ii 385; sends sailors to assist Clive at Calcutta, ii 386
Watson, Dr, ii 590
Wearg, Sir Clement, i 109; official opinions of, i 89
Webb, General, victory at Wynendale, ii 285
Webb, Philip Carteret, note on, ii 355; made by H. Secretary of Bankrupts, ii 561; draws up statement in defence of Anson and the Government, ii 355 sqq.; proposes Bute's health which is refused, iii 407; in prosecution of Wilkes, iii 467, 510; H.'s advice to on arrest of Wilkes, iii 489; correspondence, ii 355
Webster, Dr William, given financial assistance by H., ii 561
Wedel, Baron, ii 284
Wellard, Robert, Town Clerk of Dover, i 43; letter of, i 46
Wellard family at Dover, friendship with H., ii 563
Wentworth, General, commands land forces in W. Indian expedition, i 196; failure of, i 256, 257
Wesley, John, indignation at sight of a Chancery bill, ii 517 *n.*
West, Diana, i 580
West, James, secretary to the Treasury, note on, iii 400; accounts of debates, iii 4 *n.*, 562; conversation with Fox on the completion of the latter's services, iii 458; correspondence, iii 563
West, Admiral Temple, note on, ii 404; evidence against Byng, ii 380
West, Martin, *Reports* of, ii 431 *n.*
Westcliffe, Gibbons of, i 31
Westcliffe estate, alienated from the Gibbons, i 33
Westminster, Convention of, 1756, ii 274; effect in France, ii 287; denounced by Pitt, ii 275, 291; supported and approved by Pitt on obtaining office, ii 363; Bute's proposed breach of, H. on, iii 373
Westminster Hall, outrage in, i 137
Weston, Edward, Under-Secretary of State, ii 399
Weymouth, Thomas, 3rd Viscount, ii 284
Wharton, Duchess of, motion on behalf of, ii 425
Wharton, Philip, Duke of, attacks upon Lord Stanhope, i 73
Wheeler v. *Bingham*, ii 447 *n.*
Whigs, conduct in 1712, i 60; George III brought up to detest, ii 45
Whitaker, Serjeant-at-law, iii 509
White, Elizabeth; *see* Gibbon, Elizabeth
White, Thomas, i 16
Whitehead, Paul, proceedings against, i 190, 220, iii 503
Wiedmarckter, Saxon ambassador, on Pitt's promises to George II, ii 364
Wilbraham, Mr, opposes the Habeas Corpus Bill in the H. of Commons, iii 43, 554
Wild, Jonathan, prosecution of, i 79
Wildiges v. *Keeble*, ii 463
Wilhelmsthal, victory of Prince Ferdinand at, iii 368
Wilkes, John, an avowed adventurer, iii 462; friendship with Thomas Potter, iii 365; a supporter of Pitt, iii 460; Pitt gives support to agitation of, iii 363; receives encouragement from N., iii 379; tries to gain H.'s support, iii 462; ridicules Lord Bute's spelling, iii 263; publishes the *North Briton*, No. 45, iii 459;

arrest and imprisonment of, iii 460; opinion and attitude of H. in prosecution of, iii 461 sqq., 467, 495, 501 sqq., 505; Lord Temple's forwardness in defence of, iii 488; instigated by Lord Temple, iii 460; alteration of the charge against, iii 464, 466 sqq., 492; responsibility and action of Charles Yorke in arrest of, iii 466 sqq., 480; Pitt's opinions and attitude in, H.'s opposition to, iii 501, 508, 533, 539; proceedings in his case before Pratt, iii 492; on Charles Yorke's speech for the Crown, iii 461; discharged by Pratt on his privilege of Parliament and applauded in Westminster Hall, iii 460, 494, 510; H. on, iii 493–4; George III's resentment at, iii 495–6; obtains damages and acquitted of being the author of the *North Briton*, No. 45, iii 460; publishes reprints of the *North Briton*, iii 461; information for libel filed against in the K. B. but not pressed, iii 498; Pitt on privilege of, iii 543; Speaker Onslow's opinion on, iii 536; Charles Yorke's difference with Pratt and Pitt on, comments on, iii 533 sqq.; convicted of libel in the K. B., iii 462, 498 *n.*; convicted of breach of privilege by the Lords and expelled the H. of Commons, iii 481–2; duel and absence of, iii 477; on H.'s greatness, ii 529; correspondence, iii 460

Wilkes, Mrs, iii 365

Wilkinson, Rev. J., minister of the Savoy, transported for celebrating illegal marriages, ii 69 *n.*

Wilkinson, Mr, flight from the Rebels, i 469

Wilkinson, —, dismissal of, iii 442

Willes, Sir John, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, note on, raises regiment of lawyers, 1745, i 478; jealousy of H., ii 396; griefs of, ii 502 *n.*; one of Frederick, Prince of Wales's prospective ministers, ii 42; opposed to taking of the oath according to the Scottish manner, ii 460; intrigue of amongst the judges to prevent their answering H.'s questions on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 51; called in to assist in hearing of *Omychund* v. *Barker*, ii 457, 527; petulant expressions against H., ii 527; carries message from the judges to H. on his resignation, ii 336; Commissioner of the Great Seal, 1756, ii 338; on H.'s caution in interfering with the Common Law courts, ii 438; conditions demanded by on offer to him of the Great Seal, 1757, ii 408; claim to peerage of, ii 478 *n.*; passed over again for the Great Seal, ii 371

Willet, —, i 11

William III, King of Great Britain, obliged to change his ministers, iii 468, 515

William, Fort (in Scotland), siege of by the rebels, i 511, 514, 518, 520

William, Fort (India), capture and recapture by Clive, ii 385–6

William Henry, Fort, capitulation of to Montcalm, iii 116

Williams, Bishop, appointment of as Lord Keeper, ii 421

Williams, Sir Charles Hanbury, introduces Poniatowski to Grand Duchess Catherine, ii 579 *n.*

Williams, Mary, Lady, i 69, 227 and *n.*

Williams, Sir N., i 69

Williams, Peere, inscribes his *Reports* to H., ii 561; H. communicates notes to, ii 430

Williamson, General, Governor of the Tower, i 577–8

Williamson, Joseph, secretary to Lord Arlington, i 18

Willoughby v. *Willoughby*, ii 463

Wills, Mr Justice, speech on sentencing Arthur A. Lynch for high treason, i 565 *n.*

Wills and deeds, inviolability of, ii 447

Wills Act of 1752, ii 53

Wills made abroad, interpretation of, ii 544

Wilmington, Spencer Compton, Earl of, i 230 and *n.*, 160, 163, 165, 179; First Lord of the Treasury on fall of Walpole, i 280; death, i 281

Wilmot, Sir Edward, Bart., physician, ii 160; mistaken opinion of H.'s condition, iii 483; attends lady Anson, ii 593; censure of his treatment of Lady Anson by the 2nd Lord H., ii 594 *n.*

Wilmot, Sir John Eardley, judge, note on, ii 592; a disciple of H., ii 513 *n.*; on procedure connected with the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, iii 19 *n.*; on violation of public liberty by Impressment Act, iii 4 *n.*; Commissioner of the Great Seal, 1756, ii 338; opinion in the Lords against Lord Chancellor Henley's decree in *Drury* v. *Drury*, iii 389; impertinent conduct of Chief Justice Pratt to, iii 390; correspondence, ii 592

Wilson, Andrew, execution of, i 152 *n.*

Wilson, Provost of Edinburgh, disabled from holding office, i 184

Wilson, Dr Thomas, receives preferment from H., ii 560

Wilson v. *Kirshaw*, ii 478

Wimpole estate, purchase of by H., i 206; value of, ii 307; alterations at, i 349; H.'s attachment to and improvements, ii 562

Wimpole church, i 206; H.'s directions for inscription for his monument in, iii 486

Wimpole parish, legacy of H. to, iii 486

Winchelsea, Daniel, 8th Earl of, note on, ii 390; supports Convention of Hanau, i 323; does not attend debates on Mutiny Bill, ii 86; becomes 1st Lord of the Admiralty, H. upon, ii 390; strictures upon H., ii 390; and the Fox-Waldegrave fiasco, ii 399

Winnington, Thomas, note on, supports

the Pelhams against Granville, i 371; 428, 500; decides to resign, 1748, i 504
Winyard, Colonel, i 257
Wirtemburg, Prince Friedrich of, note on, Gen. Yorke's account of, iii 226
Witchcraft, ceases to be a felony, i 132 *n.*
Witnesses, credit and competence of, i 125; to a will, prohibited from being legatees, ii 53
Wivell, Edward, Chamberlain of Dover corporation, i 28
Wolfe, Colonel Edward, i 257 and *n.*
Wolfe, General James, note on, iii 198; on reprisals after Culloden, i 532 *n.*; conversation with Col. Joseph Yorke, iii 114 *n.*; merits urged by Col. Joseph Yorke, iii 114 *n.*, 198, 237 sqq.; enthusiasm for the Rochefort expedition, iii 117 *n.*; at conquest of Cape Breton, iii 137; tardy promotion of, iii 114 *n.*; recommended for promotion by Hawke and Anson, iii 114 *n.*; advancement to command, iii 113; despair of taking Quebec, iii 238; conquest of Quebec and death, iii 138, 238 sqq.; H. urges a monument in Westminster Abbey to, iii 239; opinion of Amherst, iii 114 *n.*; on Byng, ii 271 *n.*; on the Duke of Cumberland, iii 113 *n.*; on enlistment of Highlanders, iii 30 *n.*; on English military training, ii 256
Wolfe, Sir Richard, letter of, i 615
Wolsey, Cardinal, extension of Chancery jurisdiction under, ii 416
Wood, Robert, Under Secretary of State, note on, iii 87, 488; assists in arrest of Wilkes, iii 488; Wilkes obtains damages against, iii 460
Woodcock, Edward, Secretary of Plantations, iii 408
Woodhouse v. *Shepley*, ii 455
Woolsack, the, i 199
Woolston, Thomas, prosecution of, i 80
Worms, Treaty of, i 321 sqq.
Wortham, Mr, conduct in dealing with the militia rioters, iii 35, 36
Wortley v. *Birkhead*, ii 463
Wraxall, Sir Nathaniel, on Joseph Yorke as minister at the Hague, ii 575
Wray, Daniel, i 358; friendship with the Yorkes, i 213; contributor to *Athenian Letters*, i 208; describes the life at Wimpole, ii 562; correspondence, ii 141, iii 494
Wrest, i 210; value of the property, ii 307
"Wryneck," Dr, Fleet parson, ii 59
Wyatt, Rev. Walter, Fleet parson, earnings of, ii 59
Wyndham, Sir William, withdraws from Parliament, i 190; Bolingbroke's letter to, i 368
Wynendale, battle of, ii 285
Wynn, Sir Watkin Williams, leader of the Welsh Jacobites, note on, i 76, 77, 419, 424; implicated by Murray of Broughton in the Rebellion, i 582; Jacobitism overlooked, i 537
Wynne, Edward, tribute to H.'s greatness, ii 529

Y

Yarburgh, Col. James, i 403
Yarmouth, Amalie Wallmoden, Countess of, conferences with Lord Chesterfield, i 630; attitude towards the D. of Cumberland's faction, ii 87; N.'s complaints of treachery of, ii 36; coldness to N. of, ii 97, 100; supports N., ii 113; disapproves of Granville's appointment to President of the Council, ii 113; on Bute's influence over the Princess of Wales, ii 251; on the King's hostility to Pitt, ii 250; in favour of Pitt, ii 305, 323; bad opinion of Fox, ii 305; Pitt desires interest of, ii 229; Pitt's visits to, ii 277, 279, 329, 383; the King offended at, ii 332; eulogy by Pitt in the H. of Commons on, ii 277 *n.*; Pitt's relations with, iii 20; N.'s conversation with on Pitt and the King's dislike of him, iii 58; H.'s doubt of sincerity of, iii 75; endeavours to dissuade George II from making a separate Hanoverian Peace, iii 121, 166; tells George II that it will "taint his memory," iii 174; indignation at the Convention of Closterseven, iii 181; endeavours to calm George II on the D. of Cumberland's account, iii 184; Pitt's conference with on the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 49; urges N. to allow Pitt's Habeas Corpus Bill to pass, iii 50; friendship with Lord Holderness and object of, iii 107; George II angry with N. for "tormenting" with politics, ii 61; correspondence, iii 50 *n.*
Yarmouth, mayor of, attempt to bribe H., ii 523
Yonge, Sir William, speech of at Lord Lovat's trial, i 581; attacked by Lord Talbot, i 574, 583
Yorck, Counts, v. Wartenburg, i 5; descent of, i 7
York, association for defence in 1745, i 423; strength of Roman Catholics at, i 450
York, archbishopric of, special political responsibilities of, ii 23
Yorke, Hon. Agneta, 2nd wife of Charles Yorke, ii 445
Yorke, Alderman, of Cambridge, i 6
Yorke, Alice (Court), i 14; death and epitaph, i 21
Yorke, Lady Amabel, Baroness Lucas of Crudwell and Countess de Grey, i 209; ii 284; illness of, ii 592
Yorke, Anne (Mellor), i 25–7
Yorke, Bartholomew, of Richmond, i 8, 11
Yorke, Bartholomew, of York, i 12
Yorke, Bartholomew, of Calne, i 8, 10, 12
Yorke, Benjamin, i 23
Yorke, Hon. Catherine, 1st wife of the Hon. Charles Yorke, ii 574; illness and death of, ii 580, 590 sqq.; Charles Yorke on

character of, ii 591 *n.*, 593; H. on character of, ii 591
Yorke, Charles, of Basset Down, arms of, i 9, 10
Yorke, Charles, of Elcombe, arms of, i 11
Yorke, Hon. Charles, i 69; birth and education, i 76, 101; character of, ii 145; testimonies to his virtues and abilities, ii 145; excessive introspection of, ii 174; retiring disposition and diffidence of, ii 140; friendships of, i 213; early literary efforts, i 102; joint author of *Athenian Letters*, i 207; admitted to Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn, i 208; called to the bar, ii 141; early success at, ii 141; Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, ii 143; Treasurer and Librarian of Lincoln's Inn, ii 573; his arms ordered to be set up in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, ii 573; F.R.S., ii 144; entries in his fee-book, ii 141 *n.*; Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, ii 143, 179, 181, 182; publishes *Considerations on the Law of Forfeiture for High Treason*, i 328, ii 140; great abilities of, ii 140; counsel to the East India Company, ii 143; Solicitor-General to the P. of Wales, ii 143; granted patent of precedence at the Bar, ii 143, iii 555; notes of cases, ii 432 *n.*; counsel for Isaac Schomberg, ii 120*n.*; fire in his chambers, ii 144, 178 sqq., 180 sqq.; M.P. for Reigate, i 211, ii 141; lines addressed to on entering Parliament by T. Edwards, ii 142; verses addressed to his brother, Philip Yorke, ii 147; sonnet to his brother Joseph, i 292; to Joseph Yorke after Fontenoy, i 399–400; H.'s discourse to, i 629; early success in the H. of Commons, ii 142; causes rejection of bill for security of Protestant purchasers of property of Roman Catholics, ii 142; supports Regency Bill, ii 142; speech on, ii 46; defends his Father in the H. of Commons against Fox's attacks, on the occasion of the Marriage Bill, ii 65, 121, 126, 142; Fox's provocation to blamed, ii 70; to rebuke Legge for ridiculing N., ii 197 *n.*; on inferiority of a half-trained militia to a regular force, ii 266 *n.*; on H.'s successful despatch of chancery business, ii 505; visits Ralph Allen, ii 144; visit to Dover, ii 164; literary correspondence, ii 140, 143; friendship with Warburton, ii 143; Warburton's dedication of the *Divine Legation* to H., submitted to, ii 561; explains the Hereditary Jurisdictions Bill to Montesquieu, ii 173; advice from Montesquieu, ii 140; visits Montesquieu, ii 143; friendship of Montesquieu for, ii 186; visit to Joseph Yorke at Paris, ii 151, 170; at Court of Louis XV, ii 170; conversation with Lord Bath at Spa, ii 168; visit to the French Chancellor D'Aguessau, ii 170, 488; interview with Pitt, 1755, ii 228; intermediary between Pitt and the ministers, ii 228; urged by Joseph Yorke to marry, ii 178, 185 sqq.; his fancies, ii 175; 1st marriage of, ii 574; Pitt's congratulations to, ii 584; birth of his eldest son, ii 587; death of his wife, ii 580, 590 sqq.; grief at his wife's death, ii 591 sqq.; reflections of, ii 592–3; estate given him by his father, ii 143, 568; estate acquired by his 1st marriage, ii 574; death of his child, ii 586, 590; inoculation of his son for the small pox, ii 597; illness of, ii 160; recovery from illness, ii 163; 2nd marriage of, iii 445; sworn in Solicitor-General, ii 281, 316, 530–1, 572; N.'s satisfaction with, iii 195; H. on his happy prospects, ii 588; his brother, Philip Yorke, on position of, ii 572; commissioned to visit Pitt, ii 374; moves resolution in the Commons in Minorca inquiry, ii 351; draws up declarations for the H. of Commons Committee in defence of the late government, ii 351; passed over for Attorney-General in favour of Pratt, ii 371, 410; Lord Bute on, the 2nd Lord H. on, iii 364, 366; beginning of the rivalry with Pratt, ii 309, 311, 315 sqq.; consequences of, iii 364 sqq.; friendship for Charles Pratt, ii 317, 366; superiority to Pratt in his profession, ii 317; prepares official reports for Pratt, ii 572, iii 366, 504; conference with Pitt, ii 383; leading position in the H. of Commons, ii 574; opposes the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 5 *n.*, 17 *n.*, 42; speech on Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 5–6, 43; his "candour and love of liberty" acknowledged by Pitt, iii 5; conversation with Pitt upon the Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 42; on the procedure in granting writ of *Habeas Corpus*, iii 2 *n.*, 3; supports bill for increasing the Judges' salaries, iii 20; gives support to Joseph Yorke in the affair of the *Inconnue*, iii 87 sqq.; counsel in Duke of Devonshire's cause, ii 573; counsel for Lord Bute, ii 524; counsel in a prize appeal cause, iii 136 *n.*; speech on trial of Lord Ferrers, ii 573; Lord Campbell on, ii 573; on the insanity of crime, ii 573; takes leading part in trial of Dr Hensey, ii 573; large practice in appeal cases in the Lords, ii 573; W. Blackstone's application for information to, ii 572 *n.*; Lord Mansfield on exceptional legal knowledge and ability of, ii 572; George II wishes to make Attorney-General in place of Pratt, iii 46, 48; universally regarded as the next Lord Chancellor, ii 572; *Memoirs of Great Britain* dedicated to, ii 145; *Statutes at Large* dedicated to, ii 573; Lord Kames sends his legal proposals to, i 624; receives assurances of support from George III at his accession, iii 260, 305, 307; appointed Attorney-General, ii 574, iii 293, 366; memorable speech on

the German war and George II, iii 301, 339; advises N. to resign, iii 335; on Bute's hesitation and delays, iii 352; treatment by Fox whilst Attorney-General, George III on, iii 549; named by George III as successor to Lord Henley, iii 367, 369, 408 sqq.; urges upon Bute the inclusion of the Whig Lords in the administration, iii 386; conversation with Bute on the negotiations for the Peace, iii 410; criticises but abstains from voting against the Peace, iii 375; N.'s criticism of, iii 441; proposed negotiations of the Whig Lords with Pitt through, iii 424; conversation with Bute on the latter's resignation, iii 385, 487; dissatisfaction at his situation, iii 479; responsibility and conduct in arrest of Wilkes, iii 466 sqq., 480; advises Wilkes's offence to be one only of seditious libel, iii 464; H. disapproves of written opinion of on Wilkes's privilege, iii 467; H.'s advice to, iii 489 sqq.; conducts the Wilkes case for the Crown, Wilkes on speech of, iii 461; speech of, in defence of the messengers of the Secretary of State in the Wilkes affair, iii 509; refrains from pressing the information against Wilkes in the K. B., iii 498; Pitt's attitude towards, iii 472 sqq.; friendship with Pitt, ii 196, iii 364, 506, 550; Lord Temple's assurances of his own and Pitt's regard for, iii 456; desire of Pitt and Temple for a confidential union with, iii 498 sqq.; satisfaction of Lord Temple with, iii 553; Pitt's "hankering after," iii 499; conference with Pitt, June 1763, H. on, iii 503, 506, 517 sqq.; Pitt declares his preference for the Great Seal for, with the proviso of Pratt's acquiescence, H. on, iii 472–3, 498–9, 504, 507, 509; difference on Wilkes's privilege with Pitt and Pratt, N.'s and the 2nd Lord H.'s comments on, iii 533 sqq.; further interview with Pitt, Oct. 1763, iii 473; H. on, iii 533, 535, 538; change in Pitt's attitude and hostility, cause of, iii 473, 516 sqq.; Pitt repudiates all ties with, iii 482, 534; Pitt declares his preference for Pratt for the Great Seal, iii 517, 537; Pitt's jealousy of, iii 547; hostility of Pitt to, iii 547; Lord Rockingham on motive of, iii 545; offended at Pitt's usage of him, iii 477; conversation with N. on Pitt's change of attitude, and surprise and distress thereon, iii 519 sqq.; H.'s opinion of Pitt's conduct to, iii 522; H. on meaning of accommodation with Pratt proposed by Pitt, iii 535; backwardness in making an accommodation with Pratt, iii 520; N. regrets, iii 542; Legge on conduct on the privilege of, iii 538; Pitt's neglect of him in the recent negotiation communicated to by George III and a promise given of a peerage, in case he shall retain office, iii 470, 473, 537; conference of the D. of Devonshire with Pratt upon, iii 557; N. declares to Pitt his support of for the Great Seal, iii 518, 542; H.'s support of, iii 538; subsequent treatment by Pitt, iii 315 *n.*; situation of with respect to N., iii 367; disapproves of N.'s plans of opposition, iii 427; conference with N., iii 411; on slavery of eating roasted mutton with the Duchess of N., iii 367; N. demands to know his intentions, iii 426; difficult situation of, iii 471 sqq.; conversation between H. and N. on, iii 521; proposed resignation of, iii 413, 416, 519, 520, 530, 531; consults with H. and the D. of Devonshire and postpones his resignation, iii 473–4; declaration to Pitt on, iii 507; N. on motive of conduct of, iii 537; pressed by N. to resign, complaints of N. of, iii 539, 541; decides to resign, despair at his situation, iii 539; resignation of, iii 546; 2nd Lord H. on, George Grenville on, iii 474–6; Sir Joseph Yorke on, iii 551; conversation with N. on, iii 539; declares his mind to be quite composed, iii 543; parting interview with George III, various accounts of, iii 474–5, 548; reported opinion of George Grenville, iii 474; contemplates quitting the bar, ii 527; H. dissuades, iii 413, 416, 590; N., D. of Devonshire and the D. of Cumberland on great sacrifice of, iii 544; Duke of Devonshire on, and N. on great consequence of, iii 540–1; promise of support from the Whig Lords to, iii 540; D. of Devonshire's support of, iii 521; Lord Kinnoull on his greatness and situation, iii 450; Walpole on, iii 480; embarrassed situation after resigning, iii 476 sqq.; Pitt complains of, iii 476; received with applause in Westminster Hall and given precedence below the bar, iii 476, 554, 555; obtains a re-grant of patent of precedence, iii 555; votes against the government, iii 479; supports postponement of the debate upon the privilege, Pitt's delight at, iii 477–8, 556; opinion on Wilkes's privilege, exultation of the ministers thereon, iii 543; violently attacked by Pitt in the H. of Commons, iii 477; votes with the government on a point of procedure, iii 556; great speech of in the H. of Commons against the privilege, praise of, iii 478; Pitt replies to, iii 556–7; on arbitrary character of parliamentary privilege in libel cases, iii 552; treated by Pitt with marked deference, iii 479, 480, 558; asks for the support of the Whigs on the question of privilege, iii 551; the Whigs decline to follow, H.'s displeasure at, iii 555, 558; takes part against the government in debates on general warrants, iii 481, 562; altercations with Pitt, iii 563; speech in

reply to Sir Fletcher Norton, iii 563; supports amendments to declaration against general warrants, iii 480, 563; great speech in the H. of Commons against general warrants, iii 464, 480; Pitt's approbation of his conduct, iii 565; "Pitt in love with" him, iii 481, 564; drawn again towards the government, iii 479; advises George Grenville to take in the opposition, iii 479; flattering opinion of the D. of Cumberland of, iii 411; D. of Cumberland and N. on necessity of reconciliation of with Pitt, iii 559; "does not see his way," N. on, iii 560; on his Father's illness and constitution, iii 483; on his Father's death, iii 485, 565; succeeds his Father as Recorder of Dover, i 66, ii 564; correspondence, i 314, 315, 399–400, 436, 458, 462, 466, 469, 502, 507, 518, 587, 605, 655, ii 79, 120, 121, 163 sqq., 168, 170, 172, 177 sqq., 180, 182, 213, 228, 358, 373 sqq., 385, 461, 505, 524, 547, 579, 584, 586 sqq., 597, iii 32, 42, 85, 91, 105, 234, 295 *n.*, 311, 329, 352, 364, 365, 366 *n.*, 367, 408, 415, 426 sqq., 435, 489 sqq., 498, 506, 524, 529 sqq., 533, 541 sqq., 546, 555 sqq., 559 sqq., 562

Yorke, Elizabeth, daughter of Simon Yorke, i 23; will of, i 44

Yorke, Elizabeth (Gibbon), the Chancellor's mother, family and 1st husband, i 31, 33, 34, 36; dispute with Mrs Deborah Gibbon, i 39; death, i 44; tombstone, i 39; letters to her son, i 40 sqq.

Yorke, Elizabeth, i 45; marriage to Rev. John Billingsley, i 35–8

Yorke, Hon. Elizabeth, wife of Hon. John Yorke, ii 577

Yorke, Lady Elizabeth (Lady Anson) i 69; birth, i 101; abilities of, ii 158; Mrs Delany on, ii 158; character of, ii 157, 580; eulogised by Henry Fielding, ii 157; pleasure in social amusements, ii 163; correspondence with Joseph Yorke, ii 153, 157; account of Lord Lovat's trial, i 580; marriage to Lord Anson, ii 155; marriage portion, ii 155; refuses to visit Lady Yarmouth, ii 158, 184; advises Joseph Yorke against imprudent marriage, ii 184; illness and death of, ii 580, 592, 593 sqq.; verses on her death addressed to H. by David Mallet, ii 581; correspondence, i 225, 541, 580, 613, 639, 647, ii 168, 174 sqq., 183 sqq., 303, 339, 565, iii 89, 211, 237

Yorke, Rev. Henry, rector of Ripple, i 23, 24; correspondence, i 24

Yorke, Henry, of Erthig, i 27

Yorke, Humphrey, of Hannington, i 9

Yorke, Hon. and Rev. James, afterwards Bishop of Ely, i 69; birth and education, i 101, ii 155; character of, ii 577; H.'s encouragement of, ii 577; takes Holy Orders, ii 155, 577; lines addressed to, by John Duncombe, ii 155; preferments of, ii 577; rector of St Martin's in the Fields, ii 577; rector of St Giles's at Reading, ii 577; deanery of Windsor promised to, ii 594; desired by the people of Kent for Dean of Canterbury, ii 593; Preacher at the Rolls, ii 577; dean of Lincoln, ii 577, iii 260; bishop successively of St David's, Gloucester and Ely, ii 578; on life at Wimpole, ii 562; estate received from his Father on his marriage, ii 568; further provision for in H.'s will, iii 486; marriage of, ii 577, 597; estate acquired by his marriage, ii 578, 597; correspondence, ii 562

Yorke, Joan, i 11

Yorke, John, of West Hagborn, i 8

Yorke, John, of Twickenham, i 8

Yorke, John, of St Brevells, i 11

Yorke, John, of Erthig, i 27

Yorke, Hon. John, i 69, ii 591; birth and education, i 101; admitted to Lincoln's Inn, ii 155; called to the Bar, ii 155, 577; obtains office of the Chaff-Wax, ii 143, 155, 179; joint Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, ii 143; M.P. for Higham Ferrers, ii 154, 577; application by H. to N. on his behalf, ii 596; Commissioner for Trade and Plantations, ii 577, iii 260; commissioner in bankruptcy, ii 155, 577; a Lord of the Admiralty, ii 577; his Father's secretary and companion, ii 155; abstains from voting against the Peace of Paris, iii 375; resigns office at the Board of Trade, iii 474–5; H. and N. on, iii 552–4; votes against the government, iii 479, 481; votes for postponement of debate upon privilege, iii 477; votes against general warrants, iii 481; character of, ii 577; H. on, ii 596; N. charmed with, iii 417; marriage of, ii 577; estate received from his father, ii 568; further provision for in H.'s will, iii 486; grief at his Father's illness, iii 477; correspondence, ii 70, 119, 137, 151, 252, 281, 290, iii 78, 493

Yorke, Joseph, son of Simon Yorke, i 23

Yorke, Hon. Joseph, afterwards Sir Joseph, K.B., and Lord Dover, i 69; birth, i 101; enters army, i 207; ensign in the Coldstream Guards, i 213; lieutenant, i 292, ii 148; sonnet to, on beginning his military career, by Charles Yorke, i 292; his Father's advice to, i 309; character as a young officer, i 513, 521; "Little Yorkee," i 389; at Dettingen, i 298, 315; aide-de-camp to Marshal Wade in Flanders, i 330, ii 148; praised by Marshal Wade, i 360; accounts from the army in Flanders, i 299 sqq.; military journal, i 343, 351, 352, 361; illness of, with the army, i 337; rapid advancement of, ii 162; regard of the D. of Cumberland for, i 664, ii 167, 173; aide-de-camp to the D. of Cumberland,

ii 149; at Fontenoy, i 392; account of battle of Fontenoy and criticisms, i 403; account of retreat after Fontenoy and criticisms, i 409 *n.*, 435; on death of Lieut. Charles Vanbrugh at Fontenoy, i 400; conduct at Fontenoy commended, i 400; promoted captain for his conduct at Fontenoy, i 411, ii 148; Duke of Cumberland on his promotion, i 413; accompanies Duke of Cumberland as aide-de-camp from Flanders to Scotland, 1745, accounts of the campaign, i 424 sq.; expedition to Perth, i 513, 517; account of battle of Culloden, i 521; praised by George II, i 527–8; desires particulars of complaints from Lady Gask, i 536 *n.*; praised by the Duke of Cumberland, i 548; good character of, ii 162; conduct praised by the Archbishop of York, ii 162; returns with the D. of Cumberland to Flanders, i 626; account of battle of Lauffeld, i 640 sqq.; the King's satisfaction with, i 647; mission to Bergen-op-Zoom and the Prince of Orange, i 651; letter explaining military operations commended by George II, i 652; appointment as secretary to the embassy at Paris, i 656, ii 149; H. Pelham on, i 660; Duke of Cumberland on, i 682; diplomatic abilities, ii 150; abused by D'Argenson, ii 150; reply to French boast, ii 150; impressed by the great resources of France, ii 173; makes Voltaire's acquaintance, ii 150; visits Mme de Pompadour, ii 150; residence at Paris, ii 150; dissatisfaction with his situation, ii 174; Paris correspondence of, ii 165 sqq.; on French designs, ii 165; social talents, ii 150; his person and lively disposition, ii 151, 175; repartee to Mme de Puisieux, ii 165; Lord Chesterfield advises his son to make court to, ii 149; view of foreign policy, ii 152; audience with George II at Hanover, i 662, 667, ii 151; coldness of the D. of Cumberland to, ii 46, 174; British Minister at the Hague, ii 31, 151, 174 sqq.; situation of, ii 152; commended by the Princess of Orange, ii 38; influence with the Princess of Orange and her son William, Prince of Orange and Stadtholder, ii 575; described by Burgher-master Hop, ii 152; described by D'Affry, French ambassador at the Hague, ii 152; Rigby on his "pride and hauteur," ii 575 *n.*; Frederick of Prussia's testimony to his merits and abilities, iii 134, 268 *n.*; Lady Hervey on, iii 135 *n.*; Wraxall on his vigilance and ability and defects of manner, ii 575; Lord Chesterfield impresses on his son importance of forming relations with, ii 575; Walpole advises Sir Horace Mann to form relations with, ii 575; as a correspondent, ii 153, 575; "puffs" and "Yorkisms" of, ii 576 *n.*; Walpole on his "defeated victories," ii 575 *n.*; his great ability and zeal, iii 42; energy and optimism of, ii 576; George II on, ii 576; George II's approbation of his conduct, ii 281, 286, 336; supported by H., iii 21; high reputation of in diplomacy, ii 153; rapid advancement of, ii 148; considered for post of Secretary of State, 1754, ii 154; Fox's offers of friendship to, ii 281; political views of, ii 575; supports policy of conciliation towards Holland, iii 136, 158–9; protests against the landing of French cannon in Amsterdam, iii 136; visits the King at Hanover, 1755, ii 284; opinion of General Braddock, ii 257; conversation with George II on foreign affairs and Braddock's defeat, ii 285; on Amherst, Granby, Wolfe, Eyre and Abercromby, iii 114, 198, 237 sqq.; conversation with Wolfe, iii 114 *n.*; advice on position of affairs abroad, 1756, ii 296–7; opinion of the projected invasion of England, 1756, ii 287; on necessity of naval supremacy, ii 297; on the loss of Minorca, ii 269; on Byng, ii 295, 297, 303, 341, 344 *n.*; advises presents to ministers rather than subsidies to their princes, ii 296–7; on internal factions in England, ii 378; on the Hanoverian neutrality, ii 387, iii 120, 159, 170; criticisms of the D. of Cumberland's retreat to Stade, iii 167, 169; on the Convention of Closterseven, iii 124; on Pitt's policy of separate expeditions, iii 117 *n.*; on necessity of maintaining the "diversion" and the German War on the Continent, ii 411, iii 157–8; advice on measures to be taken for carrying on the war, 1757, N.'s disappointment at, iii 157–8; negotiation for peace at the Hague, 1757, and failure of, iii 116; rejects immediately D'Affry's papers as "impertinences," iii 116 *n.*; on the situation abroad, 1758, iii 196; mission to Frederick II of Prussia, iii 199 sqq., 129 sqq.; results of, iii 134; instructions of, iii 129; appointed to replace Mitchell, iii 127; Finkenstein's account of and conversation with, iii 129; character of Pitt, iii 130; arrival at camp of Frederick, iii 208; Frederick's reception of, iii 199, 209; not desired by Frederick to replace Mitchell, iii 130; endeavours to prevent Mitchell's recall, iii 132; Mitchell's jealousy of, iii 132; generous and tactful conduct towards Mitchell, iii 132 sqq.; conferences with Frederick, iii 133, 200 sqq., 209 sqq.; Mitchell on, iii 209 *n.*; distinguished treatment by Frederick of, iii 134, 213; Frederick's high esteem for and satisfaction with, iii 131 sqq., 133 sqq., 206 *n.*, 212, 213, 214; presented by Frederick with his portrait, iii 134; Frederick's parting words to, iii 213; letter of recall for from Frederick, iii 211; account of Frederick and his

army, George II's satisfaction with, iii 218, 230; on character of Frederick, iii 211; sanguine estimate of Frederick's chances of success, iii 197; admiration of Frederick, iii 134; visits Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel and assures him of support, iii 129; visit to Berlin, iii 228; satisfactory completion of his mission, iii 21; return to the Hague, iii 135; communications with Frederick regarding Holland, iii 127; valuable intelligence and advice forwarded by to Frederick, iii 127, 158; advice to Frederick how to gain Russia, iii 128; informs Frederick of the European combination formed against him, iii 127–8; Frederick's high estimation of, iii 128; plan of landing troops at the mouth of the Elbe approved by Frederick, ii 128; Pitt's jealousy of as a follower of N., ii 576, iii 20; attempts of Pitt to remove him, iii 20; Pitt desires to make minister to Frederick, H. objects to, iii 199; avoids appointment of envoy to Frederick, iii 21, 131 sqq.; declines Spanish embassy, iii 20; left without support by Pitt and Lord Holderness, ii 576, iii 21, 169, 243; incident of the *Dame Inconnue*, iii 22, 65 sqq.; separate correspondence with N., iii 21 sqq., 76 sqq., 216; Lord Holderness's jealousy of, iii 67 sqq.; Pitt acquiesces in, iii 104; situation of, between N. and Lord Holderness, iii 103; H. on, iii 109; badly treated by Lord Holderness, iii 21, 77; Lord Holderness's endeavours to supplant, iii 85; answer to the *Dame Inconnue*, George II delighted with, iii 65 sqq.; Pitt's censure of, iii 69, 78; complains to Pitt of Lord Holderness, iii 102; Pitt's attitude towards in this affair, iii 106; ungenerous conduct of Pitt to, iii 27, 87; scheme of excluding from Prince Louis of Brunswick's negotiation with France, iii 24, 86, 97; H.'s indignation at ill-treatment of, iii 70, 76 sqq., 80 sqq.; N. refrains from defending, iii 24 sqq., 69 sqq.; N. justifies his conduct in, iii 97 sqq.; N. assures of his support, iii 84 sqq.; defended by his Father, iii 25 sqq.; conduct approved and supported by George II, iii 26, 73, 99, 107; Prince Louis of Brunswick's confidence in, iii 86; Frederick of Prussia sends message of regard and confidence to, iii 26, 107; correspondence with Lord Holderness on the affair, iii 75, 83; vindication of, iii 26; Pitt repudiates any intention to injure, iii 95; Pitt undertakes to make reparation to, iii 93; Prince Louis of Brunswick instructed to include in his negotiation, iii 26, 95 sqq.; bitter feelings of at his ill-treatment, iii 27; Lord Holderness's continued hostility to, iii 99; H.'s continued uneasiness concerning, iii 103; George II desires to make Secretary of State instead of Lord Holderness, iii 42; Minister Plenipotentiary at the Congress of Augsburg, iii 73, 260, 268; attitude to Lord G. Sackville after Minden, iii 236; on Lord George Sackville, iii 340; negotiations and interviews with D'Affry at the Hague, 1759, iii 145; in favour of the separate negotiation between France and England, 1759, iii 147; on sincerity of the French, iii 145, 148; not supported or instructed properly by Pitt, iii 149; regrets the breaking off of the negotiations, iii 147; negotiation with D'Affry at the Hague, 1760, iii 243; failure of, iii 145; on the desire of Choiseul to make peace, iii 313; not supported by the ministers at home, iii 243; George II's affection and regard for, i 667, ii 594, 596, iii 79; note of the 2nd Lord H. on, iii 42; George II wishes to appoint as Secretary of State, iii 79; on George II, iii 156; situation of, in George III's reign, iii 367; on intentions of Spain, iii 151, 283 *n.*, 294; Frederick desires negotiations with France to be made through, 1761, iii 268 *n.*; suspicions of Choiseul's sincerity, iii 327; on Pitt's conduct of the negotiations and his letter to Sir James Hodges, iii 337; on the style of Pitt's despatches, iii 284; on Pitt's resignation, iii 288, 291 *n.*, 333; on the Family Compact, iii 333; on Pitt's conduct and responsibility for later misfortunes, iii 371; negotiation with Austria, iii 296, 347; on conduct of Frederick, 1762, iii 359; informs Lord Bute of the secret arrangement between Frederick and the Czar Peter concerning Holstein, iii 347; representation to Frederick on his attitude of reserve towards England, and Frederick's sharp retort to, iii 297; remonstrances against the abandonment of Prussia and the German War, iii 301, 341, 358, 400; project of dismissing repudiated by Lord Bute, iii 381, 392; not called upon to resign, 1763, iii 475; unwillingness to unite with the opposition, N.'s vexation with, iii 529 *n.*; H. on, iii 552, 554; criticisms of his conduct by the 2nd Lord H., iii 87 *n.*; on Charles Yorke's resignation, iii 551; advancement to the Secretaryship of State contemplated, iii 468; entertains the Hereditary Prince and Princess of Brunswick on their marriage, iii 369 *n.*; appointed aide-de-camp to George II, ii 91, 148, 169 sqq.; colonel of 9th regiment of Foot Guards, ii 149, 224; Major-General and Colonel of regiment of Dragoons, 1758, ii 574; Colonel of the 5th Irish Dragoons, and Lieutenant-General, 1760, ii 574, iii 260; M.P. for East Grinstead, ii 154; M.P. for Dover, ii 564, 574, iii 260; made freeman of the Town of Dover, ii 564; K.B. ii 574, iii 260; visited at Paris by Philip and Charles, ii 151; urges Charles

Yorke to marry, ii 185; deplores excessive prudence of his family, ii 146, 185; views on matrimony, ii 178; falls in love, ii 154, 182 sqq.; marriage projects, ii 154; dissuaded from by his family, ii 184 sqq.; H. and, ii 597; correspondence with Lady Anson, ii 157; on Lady Anson's refusal to visit Lady Yarmouth, ii 184; grief at Lady Anson's death, ii 595; visits to England, iii 260; exploits at Newcastle House, ii 281; salary of, i i 575 *n.*; estate of, ii 183; estate received from his father, ii 568; further provision for in H.'s will, iii 486; on Philip Yorke, ii 572; on his Father in 1760, iii 259; on his Father's death, iii 566; correspondence, i 225, 299, 305, 315, 316, 317, 338, 339, 342, 345, 349, 351, 358, 389, 392, 394, 398 sqq., 402, 403, 409, 436, 438, 439, 441, 444, 448, 451, 453, 457, 462, 463, 469, 473, 475, 477, 479, 481 sqq., 492 sqq., 499 sqq., 502, 506, 508 sqq., 521 sqq., 538, 549 sqq., 577 sqq., 605, 608, 613 sqq., 639, 651, 654 sqq., 662, 667, ii 15, 24, 31, 49 *n.*, 79, 84, 115, 121, 123, 126, 141, 165 sqq., 170 sqq., 173 sqq., 178, 180, 182 sqq., 223, 284 sqq., 291, 295 sqq., 303, 305 sqq., 312, 330, 337, 339, 361, 378, 385, 387, 394, 411, 558, 564, 565, 572, 595, iii 21 *n.*, 65, 70, 74 sqq., 83 sqq., 97, 101 sqq., 106, 111, 117 *n.*, 120, 125, 132, 145, 147 sqq., 157 sqq., 167, 169 sqq., 183 sqq., 196 sqq., 216 sqq., 243, 247, 283 *n.*, 297, 312, 322, 333, 337, 339 sqq., 347, 355 sqq., 393, 399 sqq., 417, 551; notes of George II on, ii 167, iii 210

Yorke, Margaret, of Calne, i 12

Yorke, Margaret, Countess of Hardwicke, i 36, 69; 1st husband of, ii 577; marriage to H., family of, i 68; friendship with Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, i 219, 224, 241, 275; "Cassandra," i 453; gives money to wounded soldiers, i 396; application to, on behalf of a Jacobite, i 549 *n.*; and her sons' marriages, ii 184; "good spirits for garrison duty" against the militia rioters, iii 36; preserves the purses of the Great Seal, ii 565; character and merits of, ii 565 sqq.; kindness of, i 398, 409; Tory gossip concerning, ii 566; infirmities of, ii 581; illness and death of, ii 581, iii 254, 277; H.'s grief at, ii 597, iii 324; H.'s Latin epigram upon, ii 581; will of, ii 581 *n.*; correspondence, i 219, 224, 241, 275, 342, 349, 395, 410, 434, 436, 444, 448, 453, 461, 463

Yorke, Lady Margaret (Heathcote), i 69; birth, i 101; verses to Marchioness Grey, ii 158; marriage, ii 158; dowry of, ii 159; visit to Wimpole, iii 36

Yorke, Mary (Jones), i 35–7; correspondence with H., i 41 sqq.

Yorke, Lady Mary Jemima, afterwards married the 2nd Lord Grantham, ii 586 *n.*, i 209; (Mouse), iii 545

Yorke, Philip, of St Brevells, i 11

Yorke, Philip, the elder, father of H., i 23, 34; baptism, freeman of the Town of Dover, sworn attorney, i 27; marriage, i 31; house in Snargate Street, i 35; assists in defence of the municipal liberties of Dover, i 28; refuses to take oath as counsellor and fined, i 30; family, i 36; death, i 38; tombstone, i 39; correspondence with H., i 38

Yorke, Philip, 1st Earl of Hardwicke, Lord Chancellor, family, i 10, 36, 38 sqq.; his mother's family, i 31; Gibbon descent, i 34; relationship with E. Gibbon, the historian, i 32; arms of, i 6, 9, 10; parents, i 33; birth, i 35; birthplace, i 33; his home in Snargate Street visited by Charles Yorke, ii 164; early prophecy of greatness of, school friends of, i 51; youth and education, i 48, 49; essay on a "State of Retribution," i 50; choice of a profession, letter to Chief Justice Holt, i 52; friends at the bar, i 54, 57; enters Charles Salkeld's office, i 53; industry in legal studies, contributes to the *Spectator*, i 55; aided by J. Mellor of Erthig, i 26; advantages on first beginning his career, i 58; call to the Bar, early briefs, i 62; early successes, i 63; on refusal of House of Lords to allow new peers to take their seats, on Act against Occasional Conformity, i 60; kindness towards his uncle Simon, i 26; increases his mother's income, i 43; skit on Sir Littleton Powys, i 65; Recorder of Dover, treatise of *Pardons in Cases of Impeachment*, i 66; beginning of friendship with N., enters Parliament as M.P. for Lewes, i 67

Solicitor-General, i 71 sqq.; knighted, Treasurer of the Middle Temple, supports Sir Robert Walpole, i 73; private practice, competition to secure his services, i 93, 109 sqq.; censures popular appeals from the Courts of Law, i 77; cases as Solicitor-General, i 75; state prosecutions, milder methods introduced, speech in the prosecution of Christopher Layer, i 74; fairness to accused, i 136; his zeal for the liberty of the subject applauded, i 100; not a prerogative lawyer, ii 263, 285

Attorney-General, crown prosecutions, i 79; conduct in Lord Macclesfield's impeachment, i 87; refuses to be a manager in, ii 381; official opinions and arguments of, i 89 sqq., 93 *n.*; on taxation of the Colonies and rebellious attitude of Massachusetts, i 89; on the legal status of slaves, ii 472–3; opposes extension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over laymen to the Colonies, i 90; avoids giving opinions in writing on powers of Parliament, iii 489; independent attitude in the H. of

Commons, i 98; votes against Walpole's candidate in an election petition, i 98; takes leading part in support of Excise Bill, i 98; supports the standing army, i 97; writes *A Discourse of the Judicial Authority belonging to the M.R.*, i 94; collaborates in Strange's and Salkeld's *Reports*, ii 429 *n.*; consulted by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, i 136 *n.*; professional etiquette, i 109; his splendid reputation, i 108; marriage and marriage settlement, i 68; children, i 69; education of his sons, keeps in touch with them, writes essays for them, "On Gravestones," i 102; Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn, purchases Carshalton House and the Hardwicke estate, i 107; residences, i 106, 205; relations with Charles Talbot, i 116; waives claim to the Great Seal in favour of Talbot, i 117

Serjeant, Lord Chief Justice K.B., Baron Hardwicke of Hardwicke, i 118; speech on occasion of outrage in Westminster Hall, i 138; speech to the new Serjeants, i 141; charges to the Grand Jury, i 135, 139, 144; on necessity for union, i 147; criminal jurisdiction, i 131; cases at Guildhall Sessions, i 130; as judge on circuit, i 134; firmness in suppressing crime, i 133; tries the Cornwall rioters, i 152; speech at, i 132; suppresses gambling, i 126, ii 53, 108; eulogised by Richard Savage, i 128; judgments in K.B., i 121 sqq.; appeals from in K.B., i 130; certainty in the law, i 129; avoids on principle discussion or decision of questions involving powers of Parliament in the Courts of Law, iii 466 sqq.; character of his arguments and speeches, i 119; defends authority of his office, refuses private applications, enforces law against pretensions of ambassador, i 140; as statesman, i 143; supports government measures, i 148; opposes government measures, i 149; advocates punishment of Porteous rioters, i 152; promotes the Bill inflicting penalties, i 183; censures writings of Gibson, Bishop of London, i 149 *n.*; leader of the H. of Lords, his great character and influence, i 120

Lord Chancellor, accepts the Great Seal, i 157; procession to Westminster Hall, i 160; account of the quarrel between the King and the Prince of Wales, i 161 sqq.; supports the Prince of Wales's claims, i 162; heads the mission to the Prince of Wales, i 163; endeavours to promote a reconciliation between the King and Prince, i 171 sqq.; unsuccessful efforts of, i 177; endeavours to modify the King's messages, i 164, 169, 178, 180; urges necessity of reconciliation between the King and Prince upon Sir R. Walpole, and foretells future mischiefs, i 172; "talks like an angel," but to no purpose, i 176; urges a reconciliation with the Prince upon the Queen, i 174; Prince of Wales's private conversation with, i 166, 168, 170; supports the standing army and its employment to quell domestic disturbances, i 184; warns Parliament (1738) of probability of another Jacobite attempt, i 185; visits fleet at Portsmouth, i 194, 225; supports measure for manning fleet, i 191; attitude towards the Spanish war, i 187; speech on Convention with Spain, i 189; no longer opposes war with Spain, i 194; speeches on the conduct of the war, i 196; endeavours to rouse Walpole into vigorous action against Spain, i 223; interview with Walpole, i 217; laments Hanoverian influence, i 263; America is not to be given up, i 258; "America must be fought for in Europe," i 264; "Keep up your spirits," i 259; urges despatch of envoy to Russia, i 233; moderates disputes between N. and Walpole, i 193, 221, 240, 250, 260; deprecates angry disputes at Regency Board, i 238; Henry Pelham's gratitude to for appeasing disputes, i 240; N.'s dependence on, i 216; begged to come to London by Walpole, i 261; accused falsely of intrigues against Walpole, i 191; speech in defence of Walpole, i 200; character of his influence, i 214, 229; enables "the King's Government to be carried on," i 215; happy domestic circumstances, i 214

Retains office on fall of Walpole, i 279; interview with Pulteney, i 298; speech opposing Bill to impeach Walpole, i 289; character of his relations with N., i 288; on battle of Dettingen, i 316; opposes Lord Stair's project of march upon Paris, i 319; refuses to put Great Seal to Convention of Hanau, i 323; speech in the cabinet against Convention of Hanau, i 323; supports vote for Hanoverian troops and balance of power in Europe, i 296; speech in support of Hanoverian troops, i 326; acquaintance with Lord Bolingbroke, i 96; renewal of, i 377; Bolingbroke's obligations to, i 310; good wishes from Bolingbroke, i 115; conversation with Lord Bolingbroke on public affairs, 1744, i 377; cessation of communications with Bolingbroke, i 378; support of the Pelhams, i 284; obligations of the Pelhams to, i 367; supports the Pelhams against Lord Granville, i 371; criticises Lord Orford's letter of advice, i 340; determines on the exclusion of Granville from the ministry, i 332; paper to the King, 1744, i 332, 366; reflections upon the changes made in 1744, i 373; urges the King not to go to Hanover, i 347; deputed to remonstrate with George II, 1745, i 391; narrative of his audience, i 379; receives news of Fontenoy, i 388;

on battle of Fontenoy, i 394; urges immediate reinforcement of the army abroad, i 396; speech in support of Treason Act, 1744, i 328; difficulties at outbreak of the Rebellion, i 416 sqq.; estimates real strength of the Rebellion, i 424; takes measures for public safety, i 419; on provision of artillery, i 458; rouses the country, i 421; presides as Lord High Steward at trial of the Rebel Lords, i 559 sqq.; procession to Westminster Hall, i 559 sqq.; speech at the trial of the Rebel Lords, i 562, 565; presides at trial of Lord Lovat, i 581 sqq.; puts an end to dispute between the Lords and Commons, i 583; speech at trial of Lord Lovat, i 573, 574, 586; interview with the D. of Cumberland on murder of Campbell of Glenure, i 556; legislation for Scotland, i 550 sqq., 588 sqq.; beneficial results in union of the Kingdoms, iii 114; Bill for abolishing hereditary jurisdictions, i 585, 591 sqq., 609; speech on, i 592, ii 173; reasons for, i 609; follows Cromwell's precedent, i 608; disclaims national or personal application, i 593; speech in support of Act restricting functions of Anglican Church in Scotland, i 598; carries it through, i 599; speech in support of annexing forfeited estates in Scotland to the Crown, i 600; desire to see the Union perfected, i 614, ii 534, iii 505; assimilation of the laws, i 623, ii 437, 482, 542; memory "gratefully adored" by Scotland, i 595, 617 sqq.; attitude towards enlistment of highlanders for foreign service, iii 29, 30; acquiesces in the use of the kilt by the enlisted highlanders, iii 30; support of the Church of Scotland ministers' widows' pension fund, i 616; conference with George II on the resignations, i 429, 504; promises George II never to enter into any formal opposition, iii 362; later scruples concerning his conduct, ii 247 *n.*, iii 361; anonymous lines to on return of ministry, i 431; views of foreign policy, i 295, ii 6–8, 16 sqq.; on importance of maintaining a strong navy, ii 8; the navy "the great point of all," ii 21; attitude towards the peace, i 628 sqq., 630 sqq.; urges conclusion of the peace, i 665 sqq.; opposes D'Argenson's proposals for peace, i 627, 636; refuses to put Great Seal to, i 636; refuses to put Great Seal to any treaty allowing the sea fortifications at Dunkirk, i 631; desires explanation of incidents at battle of Lauffeld, i 648; advice to N. on negotiations at Aix-la-Chapelle, i 669; urges N. to avoid quarrel with Sandwich and Bentinck, i 666; remonstrates with N., i 669; on instructions to Lord Sandwich, i 637; objects to sending hostages, i 633, 674; supports strongly alliance with Prussia, i 632, 634, 659; urges immediate despatch of mission to reassure Frederick on subject of Silesia, i 653; doubtful of prudence of England's accession to treaty between Austria and Russia, ii 23; disapproves generally of foreign subsidies in time of peace, ii 5, 17; N. appeals to for support, i 303; Henry Pelham appeals to for assistance, i 673; as peacemaker between the Pelhams, i 363, 629, 637, 652, 655, 663 sqq., ii 11 sqq., 41, 94, 101 sqq., 119; endeavours to reconcile their opinions, ii 26 sqq.; attitude regarding them, ii 5–8; remonstrates with N. on want of self-control, ii 110–1; counsels "firmness of mind," ii 99; discourse to his sons, 1748, i 629; accused by the King of asking too many favours, repudiation of the charge, ii 181–2; opposes the D. of Bedford's dismissal, ii 98; opposes N.'s choice of "little people" for the administration, ii 40, 42, 100; disapproves of appointment of Lords Granville and Holderness to the Cabinet, ii 102; relations with the Prince of Wales, i 390; endeavours to reconcile George II and Prince of Wales, ii 43; hostility of Frederick, Prince of Wales, to, ii 43; official visit to the Prince of Wales, 1750, ii 93; urges on N. importance of controlling the education of George, Prince of Wales, ii 45; speech in the Lords in vindication of Murray, Stone and Johnson, 1753, ii 48; dines at the Guildhall on Lord Mayor's Day, ii 119–20; advances Anson, ii 155; eulogy of Anson, ii 157; supports Henry Fielding in measures for suppressing lawlessness in London, ii 53; plot to assassinate, ii 53, 208; takes the lead in passing the Mutiny Bill, ii 86; speech in the Lords, ii 54; act forbidding legatees from being witnesses to a will, ii 53; opposes bill for further quieting Corporations, i 291; principles of government of Ireland, ii 133; limitations of, ii 51; condemns system of Irish pensions, ii 51; reply of Government to Lord Kildare's memorial against the D. of Dorset, ii 50, 125; chief author of the Regency Bill, 1751, ii 46; informs D. of Cumberland of provisions of Regency Bill and incurs his resentment, ii 46; D. of Cumberland's answer to, ii 46 *n.*; supports Jews' Naturalisation Bill, ii 54; on provisions of, ii 127; speech for repeal of, ii 56; Marriage Act, ii 58 sqq.; attack upon in Parliament, ii 61; attacked by Fox, ii 64; defended by the elder Horace Walpole in the H. of Commons, ii 131; defended by Charles Yorke, ii 121, 126; speech in defence of bill, ii 67; severe retaliation upon Fox, ii 66–9; George II's approval, ii 70, 122; congratulations, ii 122; dissuades H. Pelham from taxing America, ii 8; created an

earl, ii 77; ceremony on taking his place in the Lords, ii 78

Entrusted with formation of new ministry, 1754, ii 187, 205 sqq., 211; Cabinet meeting at his house, ii 191; Pitt's attitude towards, ii 201 sqq.; Pitt's relations with family of, ii 205; Pitt's opinion of as "the only resource," ii 187; secures appointment of N. as 1st Lord of the Treasury, ii 191, 207, 209; apologies from Fox, ii 206; pardons Fox and is visited by him, ii 188, 198, 222; opinion of Fox, ii 206; on dangers of Fox obtaining the chief power, ii 206; prevents it, ii 188 sqq.; gives preference to Pitt over Fox, ii 188 sqq.; fails to secure Pitt's inclusion in the Cabinet, ii 188 sqq., 193; support of Pitt's claim to office, ii 211 sqq.; Pitt's expression of obligations to, ii 203 sqq., 214; Pitt's belief in his sincerity and reverence for his wisdom, ii 194; advice to Pitt to refrain from opposition, ii 212–3; dissuades the King from dismissing Pitt, ii 221–2, 230; conversation with George II on Fox and Pitt, ii 221; as peacemaker between George II and N., ii 223 sqq.; military policy of, ii 255; opposes declaration of war with France, 1755, ii 258, 284 *n.*; on Hanoverian question, ii 260; speech in support of the German treaties, ii 260; compliments George III (Prince of Wales) when taking notes in the H. of Lords, ii 260; opposes appointment of Lord Bute as Groom of the Stole to George, Prince of Wales, ii 200, 310; reflection upon of George, Prince of Wales, ii 297; hostility of Leicester House to, ii 297; Fox's complaints of as overbearing in Council, ii 382 *n.*; deprecates taking the lead in Council on military matters, ii 283; rebukes Lord Temple in the Lords, ii 259; attacked by Lord Temple in the Lords, ii 259; on regulation of Dutch trade with France, ii 312; on N.'s alternatives of action, ii 247; distrust of Pitt's popular inclinations, ii 189; maintains good relations with Pitt, ii 229; advises appointment of Pitt to the Cabinet, ii 228, 229, 238; efforts to remove the King's hostility to Pitt, ii 236; letter in his and N.'s name despatched to the King in Hanover urging Pitt's inclusion in the Cabinet, ii 196; on Fox's overtures, ii 235; reopens negotiations with Pitt, ii 196; intermediary between N. and Pitt, ii 230, 234; conference with Pitt, Aug. 1755, ii 196, 230; explains the situation, ii 230; proposes to Pitt a seat in the Cabinet, ii 233; combats Pitt's motion of abandoning Hanover during the war, ii 232; states conditions in event of Pitt's accepting office, ii 236; further interview with Pitt, ii 197; Pitt's account of, ii 236; advice to N. on coming interview with Pitt, ii 233; continues to desire Pitt's accession to office, ii 196 sqq.; still gives preference to Pitt over Fox, ii 197; states the grounds of his opinion, ii 248; advises N. to make Pitt Secretary, ii 245; opposes N.'s retirement, ii 247; opposes inclusion of Fox in the Government, ii 197–8; opposes entrance of the D. of Cumberland into the Council of Regency, ii 199; and the Militia Bill, 1756, ii 278; speech against the Militia Bill, ii 262 sqq.; grounds of his opposition, ii 263; scheme for a militia of, ii 265; firmness of conduct at the Minorca crisis, ii 273; hostility displayed against in the city, ii 307; threats against, ii 308; declares retirement after loss of Minorca impracticable, ii 311; applies to the King on Murray's behalf, ii 301; friendship for and support of Pratt, ii 316, iii 365–6 *n.*; consents reluctantly to bring Pratt into Parliament, iii 365; offers Pratt 2nd judgeship of Chester, which is declined, ii 316 sqq., 318, iii 365; wishes to delay bringing Pratt into Parliament, ii 311, 316; continues to urge the taking in of Pitt, ii 276, 310; conversation of Fox with on public affairs, ii 330; on resignation of Fox, ii 320; Fox endeavours to explain his resignation to, ii 325; conversation of Fox with on his resignation, ii 328; induces George II to reopen negotiations with Pitt, ii 323; desired to open negotiations with Pitt, ii 323; interviews with Pitt, ii 276, 277, 328, 331; offers Pitt the Seals, which he refuses, ii 331; failure of conference, ii 326; advice to Pitt, ii 279; relation to Col. Joseph Yorke of negotiations with Fox and Pitt, ii 330; urged to remain in the Government by George II, ii 333; determines to retire with N., ii 333–4; former rumours of his resignation, ii 280 *n.*; desires N. to make Charles Yorke Solicitor-General, ii 316; resigns the Great Seal, ii 280, 338–9, 556; resigns without financial rewards, ii 280; message from the Judges on his resignation of the Great Seal, ii 336; Latin verses to, ii 556; testimonies of respect and regard, ii 335 sqq.

Lord Chancellor and Lord Chief Justice, i 160; judicial work as Chancellor, ii 413 sqq.; jurisdiction of, ii 416; by statute, in bankruptcy, extended by H., ii 417; over marriage of minors, ii 418; petition to to traverse the King's title, ii 418; power to order production of tenants for life, ii 418; over infants, ii 419; over Roman Catholic children, ii 418; over Jewish children, ii 418; over administration of charities, ii 418; over idiots and lunatics, ii 418; over offenders against ambassadors, ii

418, 464; criminal jurisdiction, ii 416; recommendation of offenders for the King's mercy, ii 416; appeal to from the courts of the Archbishops, ii 418; patron of the King's livings quoted at under £20 a year, ii 419; visitor of the royal foundations, ii 419; empowered to make assessments of tithes in the City of London, ii 418; dismissal of coroners for misconduct, ii 419; Conservator of the Peace, ii 419; exceptional authority of in the Privy Council, ii 481; appeals to the Privy Council, ii 420, 483 *n.*; commissioner for appeal in prize cases, ii 420, 483 *n.*, iii 136 *n.*; as dispenser of equity, ii 420 sqq.; equity jurisdiction, on origin of, ii 415; in theory without limits, ii 420; power of issuing prohibitions against other courts, ii 419; limitations in practice, ii 421; by professional opinion, ii 439; by necessity of uniformity, ii 435; anxiety to secure uniformity in the law, ii 437, 486, 494; necessity of systematic administration of justice, ii 498; summons the common law judges to his Bench, ii 419; regards as binding the opinions so promulgated, ii 419; arguments of the judges submitted to before pronouncement in court, ii 419; gives decisions on points of law, ii 419, 420; limitations to principle of uniformity, ii 442; independent attitude towards the common law courts, ii 441; letter to Lord Kames on independence of courts of equity, ii 443; on discretionary powers of the court of equity, ii 440 sqq., 554; relief beyond and sometimes contrary to rules of common law, ii 450; separation of equity from common law jurisdiction, ii 510 sqq.; comments of on, ii 511, 553; disadvantages of, ii 510 sqq.; account of the history of uses, ii 435; care exercised in interfering with the common law courts, ii 438, 475; influence of on the relations between common law and equity, ii 436; later amalgamation largely due to, ii 511 sqq.; control of proceedings of Court of Exchequer, ii 476; relations with the ecclesiastical courts, ii 469; aim at principle of uniformity, ii 446; control of proceedings in ecclesiastical courts, ii 475; injunctions issued against proceedings in ecclesiastical courts enforcing discreditable marriages, ii 471; divergence of moral view from that of the ecclesiastical courts, ii 470, 475; divergence of view on marriage, ii 471; court still remains one of conscience and discretion, ii 440 sqq.; limits of influence of moral considerations, ii 470; determines only rights of parties, ii 470; overrules a statute, ii 448; overrides statute of frauds in case of mistake, ii 451; greater force given to precedents to secure certainty, ii 423; on the importance of precedents, ii 424; a statute nullified by precedents, ii 428; a testator's intention yields to precedents, ii 428; on the imprudence of *obiter dicta*, ii 493; systematizing and restriction of the equity jurisdiction, and at the same time expansion of under, ii 439; special directions of expansion, ii 440; impossibility of defining extent of, ii 443; influence of "political" considerations, ii 454, 474; overrules common law, statute and precedent on the ground of fraud, ii 442; interpretation of statute law influenced by equitable considerations, ii 443; declines to follow Lord Nottingham's decision, ii 429; declines to follow Lord Talbot's opinion, ii 428; establishes new rules, ii 444 sqq.; disclaims power of legislation, ii 443, 454; limitation of powers of by appeal to the H. of Lords, ii 477; practically in abeyance in time of, ii 477; sole law Lord, ii 477; three only of his decrees appealed from, ii 478; none of his decrees reversed, ii 478; overrules his own decrees, ii 425, 474, 479, 498; reverses decrees of the M.R., ii 424, 428, 445; rehearings as distinguished from appeals to the Lords, ii 479; enumeration of methods of correcting errors in decrees, ii 516 *n.*; charge of responsibility for the later delays in Chancery examined, ii 500 sqq.; business done compared with that done by Lord Eldon, discussion thereon in the H. of Commons, ii 508; statistics of business done under H. and Lord Eldon, ii 506 sqq.; anonymous calumnies against, ii 502; weight of public duties of, ii 138; increase of business in Chancery under, ii 546; enormous load of legal business, ii 500; various attempts formerly to diminish it, ii 501; phenomenal capacity for work of, ii 501; attendance at sittings of H. of Lords compared with Lord Eldon's, ii 509 *n.*; efforts to avoid delays and expense to the suitors, ii 515; discourages petty suits in Chancery, ii 516; avoids giving a decree, ii 427, 495; urges the parties to compromise or obtain relief elsewhere, ii 427; refers the parties for justice to an Act of Parliament, ii 428; avoids constitutional decisions, ii 465; abuses among inferior officers of the Court and inquiries into, ii 517; orders of reforming, ii 517 sqq.; importance of orders of, ii 518 sqq.; neglected in later times, ii 520; insists upon publicity as a principal safeguard of the administration of justice, ii 522; success in dealing with delays and obstructions in his court, ii 516; testimonies to his rapid despatch of Chancery business, ii 504 sqq.; enforcement of his decrees, ii 474; finality of his decisions, ii 479; eulogised by

Lord Chesterfield and Montesquieu, ii 481; averse from "nice distinctions," ii 426; aim to satisfy "the reason of mankind without doors," ii 426, 439, 442, 522; "Certainty and Repose," ii 480; leading cases and decrees, ii 445 sqq.; care for the preservation of families, ii 454; security of landed estates, ii 466; protection of heirs, ii 466, 495; protection of infants, ii 466, 468, 469; control of flighty heiresses and truant schoolboys, ii 466; disallows bequest to establish Jewish seminary, ii 471; allows bequests for charitable maintenance of Jews, ii 471; slaves and slavery, ii 472; jurisdiction of foreign courts, ii 476; settles boundaries of Maryland and Pennsylvania, ii 461; establishes the principle of equity acts *in personam*, ii 461–2; principles in deciding commercial cases, ii 493 *n.*; reporters of, ii 431; MS. reports of decrees of, ii 432 *n.*; text-books dealing with his decrees, ii 432 *n.*; on subordinate value of legal treatises to decisions in the courts of justice, ii 488; on mischief of bad legal reports, reason that no remedy was applied to, ii 433; reminds Sir Michael Foster of the Lords' standing order against publication of their proceedings, ii 434; great creative work of in equity, ii 490, 520; transformation of equity under, ii 492; great reputation in the common law of, ii 436; unrivalled legal experience and training, ii 483; great judicial qualities of, ii 525 sqq.; power of generalisation, ii 489 sqq., 494 *n.*; unfounded criticisms of his decrees, ii 493; methods of reasoning, ii 494 sqq.; reasoning by analogy, ii 456, 543; reasonable and systematic conception of the law, ii 437; strength of his influence, ii 520; addresses the judges in the King's presence at St James's on their duties before going on circuit, ii 419; advance in dignity and independence of the judges under, ii 522; upholds the independence of judicial proceedings, ii 522; jealous of the reputation of the courts of justice, ii 521 sqq., 541; remonstrance to Walpole on delay in appointing a judge, ii 540; indignation at attacks upon administration of the law, ii 66, 68; displeasure at Hogarth's supposed caricature of him and the Court of Chancery, ii 521; attempt to bribe, ii 523, 549; care in judicial appointments, ii 522, 559; care in appointment of justices of the peace, ii 418, 547; appointment of justices of the peace in Scotland, i 619; greatness of his character and personality, ii 520; courtesy and good nature, ii 524 sqq.; intimate and confidential relations with the Bar, ii 439; friendly relations with the Scottish Bench, ii 532 sqq.; Jocelyn's appointment of Lord Chancellor of Ireland through, ii 536; attention to the arguments of counsel, ii 525; his speech, ii 524; delivery of his decrees, ii 527 sqq.; bearing in court, ii 524 sqq.; person and appearance, ii 529; witticism of, 524; saying of retailed by Dr Johnson, ii 529 *n.*; his great audiences, ii 529; described as Public Wisdom Speaking, ii 67 *n.*; his disciples, ii 513; testimony to his greatness, ii 484, 526 sqq.; eulogy of Lord Mansfield of, ii 530; close of an epoch marked by his retirement, ii 530; successful management of appeals in the Lords, ii 481 sqq.; appeals from Scotland, ii 539, 541; special competence to adjudicate upon appeals from Scotland, ii 482; opinion in the Lords in the case of *Gordon of Park*, ii 482; arguments in appeals to the Lords, ii 483 *n.*; appeal cases in the Lords after resignation of the Great Seal, ii 558; speaks against decree of Lord Chancellor Henley in *Drury* v. *Drury*, iii 389; on reversal of Lord Keeper Henley's decrees, iii 108; decree of Lord Chancellor of Ireland reversed, ii 483 *n.*; arbitrator in separation between Earl Ferrers and his wife, ii 574 *n.*; rulings as Speaker in the H. of Lords, *see* Lords, House of, H.'s rulings in; King's Speeches of, i 419, 420, 626, ii 79, 255, iii 66, 83, 262, 335 sqq.

Continuance in office desired by the new ministers, ii 280; warning to N. not to be minister behind the curtain, ii 338; declaration against joining an Opposition, ii 392; satirised in *The Test*, ii 375; attacked in the *Monitor*, ii 380 sqq.; firm attitude on the condemnation of Byng, ii 343; method of proceeding in interrogating the members of Byng's court-martial in the Lords, ii 344; directs the members of Byng's court-martial to answer interrogations at the bar of the Lords, ii 344; firmness in resisting pressure for Byng's pardon, ii 345–6; his view of Byng's condemnation, ii 346; attacked with violence and calumny, ii 345; takes the lead in organising the defence of Anson and the ministry, ii 353 sqq.; gives instructions regarding drawing up of statement in defence of the late government, ii 355; suggestions for Mallet's pamphlet, ii 353 sqq.; conversation with Pitt, ii 349, 375; advice to Pitt on taking office, ii 376; overtures of union with Pitt, ii 375; on the situation, 1757, ii 390 sqq.; on failure of Pitt's administration, ii 393; desires a junction of N. and Pitt on the latter's dismissal, ii 366; unsuccessful interviews with Pitt, ii 367; considers Pitt impracticable, ii 367; prevents junction of N. and Fox, ii 366; dissuades N. from returning to office without Pitt, ii 367, 389, 396;

Lord Winchelsea's strictures upon, ii 390; George II on conduct of, ii 388; great position and influence of, ii 369, 557 sqq.; ordered by George II to settle an administration, ii 368, 400, 403; George II's heated conference with, ii 369, 401, 403; obtains the K.'s leave to bring in Pitt, ii 369; negotiations, ii 401 sqq.; succeeds in forming the Pitt-Newcastle ministry, ii 370; obtains Anson's restoration to the Admiralty, ii 370, 403, iii 114; allows Charles Yorke to be passed over for Attorney-General in favour of Pratt, ii 371; acts "too disinterestedly," iii 366; 2nd Lord H. on, ii 410; desire of Pitt to diminish influence of in Westminster Hall, iii 20, 57, 364–5; urged by N. to take again the Great Seal, ii 395; refuses to return to office, ii 370; refuses to remove Lord Granville, ii 371; regret of Bute and the Prince of Wales, ii 398; joins the cabinet without office, ii 371; congratulations to on settlement of the administration, ii 406, 410 sqq.; George II grateful to, iii 468

Steadily supports the Pitt-Newcastle administration, iii 28; mediator between N. and Pitt, iii 31, 39, 111; advice to N. in dealing with Pitt, iii 39; influence with Pitt, iii 39; "constant go-between" in N.'s commissions, iii 42; mediator between N. and Anson, iii 31; pacifies resentment of the Duke of Argyll, iii 108; Bute on credit and consequence of, iii 54; George II wishes to make Lord President of the Council in place of Granville, iii 46, 48; "winks at many things for the sake of union," iii 28; supports militia bill of 1758, iii 53, 110, 112; on the failure of the Militia Act, iii 29; popularity with the militia rioters, iii 32, 36; prepares to receive the militia rioters at Wimpole, iii 35; advice to the ministers on the militia riots, iii 33, 37; on Pitt's scheme of enlisting Highlanders, ii 378, 383; supports the giving of the Garter to Lord Temple, iii 23, 58, 64; visit from Lord Temple, iii 91; despair of the situation in 1757, iii 123, 160; on the Hanoverian crisis, iii 163 sqq.; summoned to town by Pitt's desire, iii 166, 180, 183–4; informs George II of his opinion regarding the Hanoverian Neutrality, iii 175; endeavours to dissuade George II, iii 121, 173, 175; on the Convention of Closterseven, iii 182; urges immediate grant of money at the Hanoverian crisis, iii 121; on the Duke of Cumberland's conduct in Hanover, iii 188 sqq.; in mitigation of the D. of Cumberland's conduct, iii 183, 194; on necessity of responsible commander-in-chief to succeed the D. of Cumberland, iii 190 sqq.; George II's gratitude for his support, iii 171; doubts of the wisdom of Pitt's project of ceding Gibraltar to Spain for Minorca, iii 123 *n.*, 168; aversion to the war, ii 310–11; support of Clive, ii 387; congratulations to Clive and assurances of support, iii 195; objection to Pitt's policy of separate expeditions, iii 252; grounds of, iii 117–18; opposed to further reinforcements for Cherbourg, iii 230; advises sending reinforcements to Prince Ferdinand, iii 230, 242; testimony to his grasp of strategy, iii 115; Frederick of Prussia sends message to, iii 131; in favour of the separate negotiation between France and England, iii 147; urges Pitt not to reject it, iii 242; anxiety arising from Pitt's reluctance to peace, iii 149, 150; on moderation in negotiations for peace, iii 239; on imprudence in treating with France to wait for the "highest throw of the dice," iii 150; on the Newfoundland Fisheries and the Treaty of Utrecht, iii 452; approves of Pitt's replies to the Spanish complaints, iii 152, 250; Pitt's conferences with, iii 28 *n.*, 242; project of agreement with the Dutch of, iii 136, 231; has interview with the Dutch Commissioners on the trade disputes, iii 137; Princess Royal, Regent of the Netherlands begs for advice and support of, iii 170; gratitude of the Princess of Orange to for support, iii 231; opposes Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 6 sqq.; Pitt on his "vanity," iii 49–51; speech in H. of Lords against Habeas Corpus Bill, iii 6 sqq.; vindicates the judges, iii 6 sqq., 55; refers questions to the judges, iii 13, 49 sqq.; speaks again against the bill, iii 17; reply to Lord Temple, iii 14; censures Lord Temple's attack upon the law and the judges, iii 14; proposes a new measure dealing with the Habeas Corpus, iii 18, 19; refuses to allow Joseph Yorke to be transferred from the Hague to Berlin, iii 131; indignation at treatment of Joseph Yorke in the *Inconnue* affair, iii 26; takes up his defence, iii 25 sqq.; objections to N.'s conduct, iii 71; vexed at N.'s fears, iii 105; threatens N. to retire from public business unless satisfied, iii 26, 87; "Considerations relating to Major-General Yorke," iii 25; unusual low spirits of, iii 89; compels N. to undertake Joseph Yorke's defence, iii 26; obtains the K.'s support, iii 26; desires a declaration from the K. to Lord Holderness of his approval of the correspondence, iii 104 sqq.; scathing letter of reproach to Lord Holderness, iii 26, 82; never forgives Lord Holderness, iii 84 *n.*; interview with Pitt on the affair, iii 26, 92 sqq.; memorandum of for the Cabinet directing the inclusion of Joseph Yorke in Prince Louis of Brunswick's negotiation, iii 26, 94; approved and adopted by Pitt, iii

95; continued uneasiness regarding Gen. Yorke, iii 103 sqq.; N.'s memorandum for the K. on, iii 83; advice to N. on various topics of domestic politics, iii 110; on finance, iii 246; on possibility of peace, iii 245

George III's gracious reception of at his Accession, iii 259, 307; advises N. to retire at, iii 261, 305, 307, 311; conference with Pitt, iii 308; endeavours to secure N.'s power in new arrangements, Fox on, iii 262, 309; vigour and youthfulness of, iii 259; continues in the administration, iii 259; pressed by Bute to take the Presidency of the Council and refuses, iii 259, 260; as peacemaker, iii 259; desired to come to town by Pitt, iii 248; repartee to George III, iii 264; draws up the 1st King's Speech for George III, iii 262, 310 sqq.; incorporates George III's paragraph, iii 263; paragraph added by to the Address, iii 263, 312; opposes Pitt's expedition to Belleisle, iii 267, 311; advises Pitt against insisting on exclusion of France from the Newfoundland Fisheries, iii 269; advises grant of restricted right to the Newfoundland Fisheries to France, iii 271; distrust of Pitt's conduct of the negotiations, iii 289; on Pitt's changed attitude and enthusiasm for the war, iii 317; disapproval of Pitt's despatch of July 24, 1761, iii 318; concurs in the breaking off of the negotiations with France, iii 274; grounds of his opposition to war with Spain, wisdom of in principle and in execution, iii 290, 327, 340 sqq.; opposes N.'s resignation, 1761, iii 319; notes of meetings of the Cabinet, Aug. 14 and 24, iii 271 sqq., 320, 321; contest with Pitt, iii 320; "note of one particular said by," iii 273; note of Cabinet meeting of Sept. 18, 1761, iii 275; absence from meetings of the cabinet, iii 277; notes of cabinet meeting of Oct. 2, 1761, iii 277; speech at against declaration of war against Spain, iii 279; despatch of temporising character to Lord Bristol substituted by his advice for Pitt's declaration of war, iii 274, 276; opinion on instructions to be sent to Lord Bristol, iii 276; mitigating letter added to Lord Egremont's despatch to Spain, Oct. 28, 1761, by his advice, iii 294; Pitt's visit to after his resignation, iii 281, 329, 332; visit and compliments from Lord Bute, iii 330; interviews with Bute and George Grenville, iii 333; Lord Bute's opposition to appointment of as Lord Privy Seal, N.'s indignation at, iii 328; declines the Privy Seal, iii 292; King's Speech of Nov. 6, 1761, Bute and Grenville's proposed additions to, iii 294, 335 sqq.; memorandum of for N. on measures to be pursued, iii 293; on Pitt's letter to Hodges (Beckford), iii 333; on Fox and the proposal to supply Pitt's place with, iii 328; on alliance of Fox and Bute, iii 422; on conduct of Frederick of Prussia, iii 343; disapproval of Lord Bute's negotiation with Austria, iii 296; on the subsidy to Frederick as already promised, iii 344–5; on disastrous policy of separating from Frederick, iii 299, 300, 345, 373; conversations with Lord Bute on the Prussian alliance and subsidy, iii 300–1; urges Bute to continue it, iii 300–1, 346, 348 sqq.; opposes in vain in the Council Bute's refusal of the Prussian subsidy, iii 302, 352 *n.*; deprecates N.'s resignation on a personal question, iii 352; advises N. to retire, iii 355; repugnance to joining an organised opposition, iii 361 sqq., 391, 432 sqq., 444, 446, 495, 505; Walpole on, iii 371 sqq.; Lord Kinnoull's testimony to, iii 449; on N.'s impracticable "middle scheme" of Opposition, iii 376 sqq., 420; advises N. to refrain from organised opposition, iii 379, 415, 425, 432 sqq.; refuses to take active part in negotiations for ministries, iii 424; announces his intention to retire altogether from politics, iii 354; left out of the Council, iii 359, 372, 435, 504; observations upon, iii 392, 394, 396–7; Charles Yorke's complaint of to George III, iii 550; neglect of by the Court, iii 303; retirement of from public life, iii 302; verses to by Lord Lyttelton on, iii 303; on the possible overloading of England with "foreign" colonies, iii 287; on importance of the West Indies and the sugar trade, iii 347; conversation with George Grenville, 1762, iii 397; conference with Bute, iii 392, 395–6; declares himself connected with N., iii 393 sqq.; further interview with Bute on negotiations for peace, iii 402 sqq.; Bute's overtures to, iii 404; conversation with Lord Mansfield on the terms of peace, iii 452; displeasure at Lord Bute's Scottish Militia Bill, iii 346; offered office again, iii 369; again consulted on public affairs, iii 370; overtures from the Court, iii 423, 424, 429; relations with Pitt, 1762, iii 424; on Peace of Paris, iii 504; against opposition to the Peace but overruled by the Whig Lords, iii 449; Lord Kinnoull's regrets at the neglect of his advice, iii 512; speech in the Lords against the Preliminaries of Peace, iii 372; vexation at Lord Royston's vote in favour of the Peace, iii 376, 443, 449; refuses with N. to convey address of congratulation on the Peace to the King from Cambridge University, iii 384; condemnation of Bute and Fox, iii 446; conversation with Lord Temple on Pitt's intentions, iii 454; at dinner of the Whig leaders at the Duke of Devonshire's, iii 381, 455; maintains his freedom

of action, supports the government on the demand for the war accounts, iii 381; Bute's thanks for, iii 455; conferences with Lord Egremont, iii 495, 512, 513; N. on object of, iii 497; Pitt's jealousy of, iii 468, 473, 518, 528; refuses offer from the King of office of President of the Council, iii 468, 513–4; declares that the Whigs can only come in as a party, iii 468; advises that George III should "go roundly and to the root of the evil," iii 515; speech in the Lords against the Cider Bill, iii 382; approbation of Pitt and the Whig Lords, iii 456; last vote of in the H. of Lords, against a money bill, iii 383; visit to Claremont, "high health and spirits," iii 399; difficult situation and views of, the 2nd Lord H. on, iii 471, 475; Lord Kinnoull on, iii 512; advice to N. on the proscription of his friends, iii 448, 450 sqq.; *Impavidum ferient ruinae*, iii 454; adherents of spared in Bute's proscriptions, Fox's remonstrances to Bute on, iii 380; N.'s letter of reproach to and reply of to, iii 376, 439 sqq.; Duke of Devonshire on, iii 449; Lord Kinnoull on, iii 449; N.'s complaints of to the D. of Devonshire, iii 532; subsequent conference with N., kindness and affection of, iii 445; objects to the D. of Cumberland as a leader of the Whigs, iii 444; objects to N.'s alliance with the D. of Cumberland and Princess Amelia, iii 362, 390, 433; opinion of the D. of Cumberland as pushing on the opposition, iii 446; refuses to order the resignation of his sons, iii 368, 433; on Bute's resignation and conduct, iii 457–8; visit from Clive and his father, iii 489; attitude in the Wilkes prosecution, iii 461 sqq.; on the Wilkes affair, iii 501 sqq., 505; Wilkes tries to gain support of, iii 462; disapproves of supporting Wilkes, iii 491; repudiates any share in the attacks upon Scotland, iii 503, 505; opinion of the proceedings on the arrest of Wilkes, iii 467; advice on, iii 489; disapproves of Charles Yorke's giving a written opinion on Wilkes' privilege, iii 467; on power of Secretary of State to issue warrants, iii 463; opposition to Pitt's legal notions, iii 501; upholds doctrine of restriction of juries to verdicts of fact, iii 501; grounds of his opinion, iii 464–5; on Pratt allowing the jury to return a general verdict, iii 511; disapproval of Pratt's judgment that libel is covered by parliamentary privilege, iii 466; reported opinion of on privilege in case of bribery quoted by Pratt, iii 493; approves of the rejection by Parliament of privilege in libel, iii 478; disapproval of Pratt's judgment that libel is not a breach of the peace, iii 466; summoned to London on the negotiation of Pitt with George III, iii 469; Pitt's respect and regard for as absolutely necessary in administration, iii 517, 531; named by Pitt as President of the Council, iii 469, 528; Pitt gives an account of the transaction to, iii 524; attachment of to N. and the "point of honour" the cause of Charles Yorke's resignation, iii 474, 476; conversation with N. on Charles Yorke's situation, iii 521; dissuades Charles Yorke from leaving the Bar, iii 416; slighted by Pratt and aversion to, iii 522; opinion of Pitt's conduct to Charles Yorke, iii 522; on Pitt's unreasonableness, iii 536; displeasure at the Whigs following Pitt on the point of privilege instead of Charles Yorke, iii 558; on legality of general warrants, iii 463; advises his sons to vote against general warrants, iii 479, 562; the Duke of Cumberland's regard for, iii 559; the Duke of Cumberland proposes to visit and explain his conduct to, iii 483, 559; wishes to forget modern politics, iii 559; outward composure of notwithstanding "incidents of mortification," iii 486; vexation at political developements shortening life of, iii 444 *n.*; Lord Kinnoull on greatness of, iii 512; looked up to once more (1764) to settle the government, iii 482; good health in summer of 1763, iii 516 *n.*, 565 *n.*; strength of his constitution, iii 483; long and uninterrupted friendship with N., iii 560; last illness of, iii 477, 482, 544, 545, 548, 553, 558; attacks upon him in his last illness, iii 484; indignation at George III's support of Lord Sandwich's candidature for the High Stewardship of Cambridge University against Lord Royston, iii 485, 561; death of, iii 485; consequences to his family, iii 565; funeral, iii 486; will of, iii 486; directions for inscription of monument in Wimpole church, iii 486

Domestic happiness, ii 139, 159, 562, 565, 571; congratulations from the Archbishop of Canterbury on, ii 571; N. on, iii 380; happiness in his liberty on resignation of the Great Seal, ii 562; not recognized by George II without his Chancellor's wig, ii 557; great position of his family, ii 578; H. Walpole on, ii 572; happiness in his sons, Lord Granville's praise of their remarkable abilities, ii 578 sqq.; Count Poniatowski's impressions of, ii 579; Latin verses in praise of, ii 578; anxiety on account of Charles Yorke's illness, ii 160; solicitude for Lady Anson, ii 163; grief at Lady Anson's death, ii 580, 594; on precautions for Lady Grey when expecting a child, ii 585; on Joseph Yorke's project of marriage, ii 184; on death of Charles Yorke's child, ii 586; affection for his wife, ii 581; grief at his wife's death, ii 581, 597, iii 324; Latin epigram on

death of his wife, ii 581; simplicity of his private life, ii 571; health of, ii 220; wins a race on horseback against Sir John Heathcote, ii 139; illness of, ii 579, 592, iii 75, 78, 80, 81, 84, 87 sqq.; various public offices of, ii 558; High Steward of Cambridge University, i 207; LL.D. Cambridge, ii 139; a principal trustee of the British Museum, ii 558; presides at meetings of, ii 298; ecclesiastical patronage, care and rules in exercising, ii 559, 560, 584; impression made upon by Sherlock's sermons, ii 559 *n.*; recognition of literary merit, ii 560; discourages laudatory dedications, i 620, ii 561; inscriptions of books to, ii 561; declines a conference where French is spoken, i 343; his estate, ii 570; salary of as Chancellor, i 158 *n.*, ii 570; change of London residence, ii 556; purchases Wimpole, i 206; jealousy of his prosperity, ii 569; supposed riches of, ii 390; charges of avarice examined, ii 567; generosity of, ii 567 sqq.; friendships of, ii 563; Chief Baron Idle on his capacity for friendship, ii 564; attachment and services to Dover, ii 563 sqq., 587; honoured at Dover, ii 164; veneration of the people of Kent for, ii 593; "greatness of his way of thinking and writing," iii 91; firmness of mind, ii 139; buoyancy of spirits, ii 139; tenderness of his feelings, i 409; power of memory, ii 559 *n.*; Lord Chesterfield's "character" of, i 629 *n.*, ii 567; Mrs Montagu on, ii 569; Lord Waldegrave's "character" of, ii 258 *n.*; criticised by J. Nicholls, ii 567 *n.*; Horace Walpole's character of, ii 567 *n.*; abused by Lord Hervey, i 280; abused by Lord Chancellor Henley, iii 374; Lord Bath's love and honour for, ii 168, 220, 336, 546; Lord Bolingbroke's admiration of, i 97; Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough's respect for, i 219; Duke of Somerset's firm friendship for, i 243; Murray's gratitude to, ii 329; letter of thanks to from Lord Keeper Henley and later ingratitude of, iii 109; Lord Granville's veneration for, i 214 *n.*; Duke of Grafton's friendship for, ii 383; verses in praise of by Hawkins Browne, ii 496; Lord Lyttelton's obligations to, iii 409; Lord Lyttelton's verses to, ii 571; Count Poniatowski on, ii 584; Pitt's honour and respect for, ii 210; Pitt's reverence for his judgment, ii 215; professions and obligations of Pitt to and repayment of, iii 315; Henry Fielding on his authority and influence, ii 53; George II on courage of, iii 61; George II's regard for, ii 400, iii 60, 233; sense of his obligations to George II, iii 310

On the Tory ministry of 1712 and the Peace of Utrecht, i 59; justifies maintenance of Roman Catholicism in Minorca, i 205; opposes claim of Scottish judges to be heard within the House of Lords, i 184; complains of hurried consideration of bills sent to the Lords at the end of the session, ii 263, iii 383; objects to army under military control, i 198; disapproves of a nation of soldiers, ii 264; on the impracticability of isolation from the continent, ii 260, iii 373; on origin of the national greatness and prosperity, ii 264; on administration of justice as the chief part of government, i 594; on the Protestant Succession, quoted by Lord Eldon, i 575; memorandum on exercise of royal prerogative of pardon, i 570; on circumstantial evidence, i 557; on liberty of the press, i 85, 190, 220–1, iii 466, 501; and support of the press, ii 373 *n.*; on law and liberty, iii 12, 15; on law and morality, i 146; on the necessity of "certainty" in the law, ii 423; on the balance of the Constitution, i 144, ii 263–4, iii 15; on the Bar as a profession, ii 527, iii 416; defence of the conveyancers, iii 390; on party government, i 59; on the necessity of, iii 468, 496, 515; advice to his eldest son in an election campaign, ii 160; advice to his son, Joseph Yorke, at outset of his military career, i 299, 309; on sanction and validity of oaths, i 459; on an opposition, iii 362; on the founding of families, ii 570; on duelling, ii 589; on principles of legislation, ii 57, 77, 263, iii 13; on principles of taxation, iii 382; religious tolerance, i 61; on perils of a second marriage late in life, ii 582; on ill-humour, iii 111; on imprudence of writing in a passion, i 670, ii 89; on forgiveness, iii 391; against "expostulations amongst friends," ii 205; correspondence, *passim*.

Yorke, Hon. Philip, Viscount Royston and afterwards 2nd Earl of Hardwicke, i 69; birth and education, i 101; friendships and character, i 213, ii 146, 588; writings of, i 102, 212, ii 146; correspondence with Birch, ii 146; joint author of *Athenian Letters*, i 207; author of the Armada newsletters, i 212; Birch's *Sir T. Edmondes' Negotiations* and Young's *Night Thoughts* dedicated to, ii 146; annotator of Burnet, ii 146; verses of alluding to Jacobite potations, ii 566; marriage, i 209, 236; verses addressed to by Charles Yorke, ii 147; verses to by Soame Jenyns and T. Edwards, ii 147 *n.*; M.P. for Reigate and subsequently for Cambridgeshire, i 211, ii 148; Cambridgeshire election campaign, ii 160 sqq.; in the H. of Commons, ii 147–8; seconds the Address, 1743, i 325; moves Address, 1745, i 386; manager for the H. of Commons in the trial of Lord Lovat, i 577; examines Sir Everard Fawkener, i 583; Parliamentary Journal of, i 211, 320, 323, 330, 335; Lord Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire, i

207, ii 147; on carrying out the Militia Act, iii 32 *n.*; asks for soldiers to deal with militia rioters in Cambridgeshire, iii 32; LL.D. Cambridge, ii 147; F.R.S., ii 146; F.S.A., ii 146; Trustee of the British Museum, ii 147, 558; Burgess of the city of Edinburgh, i 621 *n.*; Teller of the Exchequer, i 210; character and weight in the country and H. of Commons, ii 571; H. Walpole advises Horace Mann to gain his friendship, ii 572; Pitt visits at Wrest, ii 196 *n.*; visit to Joseph Yorke at Paris of, ii 151; H.'s discourse to, 1748, i 629; note of on N.'s dispute with Sandwich, i 665; on H. Pelham's refusal to tax the American colonies, ii 8 *n.*; on policy of foreign subsidies, ii 3 *n.*; on futility of N.'s German negotiations, ii 5; on mistakes of N.'s administration 1754–6, ii 195; on mistake of N. in not securing Pitt in 1754, ii 193; on mistake of precipitating the war, 1754, ii 256; on Pitt's conduct, ii 213 *n.*; on N., i 669, ii 335, iii 310; on H. Pelham, i 627, 683, ii 78; on quarrels of the Pelhams, i 676, ii 10; on Lord Halifax, ii 409; on Lord Granville, ii 234; on Horace, Lord Walpole, ii 298; on General Braddock, ii 285; on Charles Yorke's position in his profession, ii 572; on the sacrifice of Charles Yorke's claims to promotion in favour of Pratt, iii 364, 366; on the situation of his Father after resignation of the Great Seal, ii 557; on the great position of the family, ii 578; on Lord Anson, ii 156; defends Anson, ii 347 *n.*, 351; manager for the Whigs in the Minorca inquiry in the H. of Commons, ii 351; rebukes Beckford in the H. of Commons for abusing the Lords, iii 18; Pitt replies angrily to, iii 18; on conduct of the D. of Cumberland and the convention of Closterseven, iii 122; on improvement in military appointments after retirement of the D. of Cumberland, iii 114; gives assistance to Gen. Yorke in the affair of the *Inconnue*, iii 93; observations on J. Yorke's correspondence with the *Inconnue*, iii 23; on Pitt's conduct in the affair, iii 24 *n.*; on strength of Lord Holderness's position, iii 96; on Lady Anson's death and character, ii 580, 594; on situation of the family at accession of George III, iii 259; moves the Address on George III's accession, ii 572, iii 260, 263; speech of praised by Pitt, ii 572, iii 312; made a member of the Privy Council, ii 572, iii 260, 315 *n.*; on his mother's death, ii 581; on Pitt's speech in the Cabinet of Sept. 18, 1761, iii 276; on Pitt's "insolence," iii 272; account of debate on the Address, Nov. 13, 1761, iii 338; on Bute's intrigues to gain power, iii 291; on Bute's treatment of Pitt and N., iii 264; criticises the acquiescence of the Whig Lords in the war with Spain, iii 295 *n.*; disgust at Pitt's conduct, Oct. 1762, iii 427; political relations with N., iii 426, 427; on the political situation, Oct. 1762, and N.'s projects of opposition, iii 427; on N.'s impracticable scheme of opposition, iii 377; on situation of the family, iii 372; vote in favour of the Preliminaries of the Peace of Paris, H.'s vexation at, iii 375–6, 441, 443, 449; on ill-treatment of the Hereditary Prince of Brunswick by the Court, iii 369; visit to the D. of Devonshire, iii 525; on H.'s situation and views, Nov. 1763, iii 475; on the prosecution of Wilkes, and H.'s opinion thereon, iii 467; account of Charles Yorke's parting interview with George III, iii 475; criticisms of Joseph Yorke's conduct, iii 87 *n.*; on Bute's and Pitt's treatment of the family, iii 367; on Pitt's incapacity for friendship, iii 364; on Lord Chancellor Henley, ii 408; votes against the Government, iii 479, 481; votes for postponement of debate upon the privilege, iii 477; votes against general warrants, iii 481; on Charles Yorke's speeches on the general warrants and privilege, iii 481; conversation with Lord Temple on Pitt, iii 556; candidature for the High Stewardship of Cambridge University, circumstances of, Lord Chesterfield on, iii 484, 485; H. on, iii 561; opposed by Lord Chancellor Henley, iii 109 *n.*; on his Father's resentment at George III's conduct, iii 485; on H., iii 479; on his Father's death, iii 485, 565; notes by, i 119, 152, 176, 202, 230, 241, 245, 249, 278, 308, 328, 337, 363, 365, 367, 369, 371, 377, 378, 391, 397, 422, 499, 529, 554, 601, 638, 655, ii 102, 112, 154, 182, 198, 200, 218, 219, 235, 237 sqq., 246 sqq., 304, 373, 379, 388, 592, iii 42, 71, 84, 104, 166, 174, 182, 194, 198, 214, 278, 285, 306, 325, 339, 347, 352, 444, 494, 516, 538, 561, 565; correspondence, i 220, 221, 252, 267, 276, 305, 314, 339, 345, 349, 398, 409 *n.*, 411, 434, 435, 436, 439, 441, 446, 450, 451, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 461, 464, 473, 477, 498, 500, 507, 512, 528, 539, 542, 545 sqq., 549, 575, 586, 595 *n.*, 599, 604, 614, 650, 654, 666, ii 29 sqq., 70, 119, 120, 124, 126, 131 sqq., 137, 141, 151, 161 sqq., 252, 281, 284, 288, 290 sqq., 295, 297, 303, 305 sqq., 336, 378, 387, 393, 399, 461, 562, 581, 585, 588, 592, iii 34, 43, 78, 89, 93, 105, 114, 120, 147, 169, 178, 183, 206 *n.*, 217, 238, 243, 288, 295 *n.*, 299, 310 sqq., 320, 321, 333, 338, 340, 359, 367, 388 sqq., 398, 405 *n.*, 427, 431, 435, 455, 492 sqq., 509, 512, 525 sqq., 545, 551, 556, 560 sqq., 565

Yorke, Philip, afterwards 3rd Earl of Hardwicke and Viceroy of Ireland, K.G., birth of, ii 574, 587, 591; inoculation of for the small-pox, ii 597
Yorke, Philip James, Colonel, note by, i 8
Yorke, Philip, of Erthig, author of the *Royal Tribes of Wales*, i 27; legacy of H. to, iii 486; note by, i 96 *n.*
Yorke, Sir Richard, mayor of the Staple in Calais, i 12
Yorke, Simon, of St John's College, Oxford, vicar of Sutton Benger, tenant in Rowde and Bromham, i 10
Yorke, Simon, of Dover, i 10; attitude and opinions, i 17; municipal offices held by, i 14, 15; supplies wine to Algernon Sidney, absence and reappearance in the council and conflict thereon, returns at the Restoration, Chamberlain, i 15, 16; attends conventicles, summoned before Privy Council, i 19; displaced from office and deprived of the freedom of the town, i 18; marriage license, i 13; family, i 23; second marriage, death, will and estate of, i 21, 22; epitaph, i 10, 22
Yorke, Simon, son of Simon Yorke, of Dover, marriage, unfortunate career, death, founder of the Erthig branch, i 23, 24, 26, 27, 31
Yorke, Simon, of Erthig, i 77; correspondence, i 26, 615
Yorke, Susan, i 9
Yorke, Thomas, of Hilthrope, i 8
Yorke, Thomas, of Wiltshire, i 11
Yorke, T. E., note by, i 9
Yorke, Walter, i 11
Yorke, William, the Younger, i 8
Yorke, William, of Elcombe, i 9, 12
Yorke, Sir William, Chief Justice of Ireland, i 6, ii 51
Yorke, families of, arms of, i 5
Yorke, pedigree of, family of, i 8; family of Edington, Lydiard Tregoze and Hannington, i 9, 10; Wynne Yorkes, of Dyffryn Aled, i 27; arms of Wiltshire family, i 10; arms of in Marchwiel Church, i 10; arms of in St James's Church, Dover, i 44
Yorke House at Twickenham, i 8
Young, Edward, the poet, dedicates *Night Thoughts* to Lord Royston, ii 146
Ysenbourg, Count d', taken prisoner, i 643

Z

Zastrow, Major-General, commander of Hanoverian infantry at Fontenoy, i 407; criticises the D. of Cumberland's retreat to Stade, iii 119 *n.*
Zeame, Mr, i 108
Zieten, General Hans, note on, Gen. Yorke's account of, iii 224–5
Zigesaer, M., aide-de-camp to the D. of Cumberland, killed at battle of Lauffeld, i 643
Zorndorf, battle of, iii 137

THE END

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

S0-BUW-908